

4575.8.
A FULL
DISPLAY
OF SOME
LATE PUBLICATIONS

ON THE SUBJECT OF
TITHES

AND THE SUFFERINGS OF THE
Established Clergy
IN THE
SOUTH OF IRELAND,
ATTRIBUTED TO THOSE DUES.

WITH
STRICTURES
NECESSARY FOR THE
FURTHER
ELUCIDATION OF THAT SUBJECT.

Quis justius induit arma
Scire nefas; Magno se judice quisque tuetur.

LUCAN;

BY CANDIDUS.

DUBLIN:

Printed by W. SLEATER, No. 28, Dame-street.

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

[PRICE TWO SHILLINGS BRITISH.]

48.

4.

7.

153.



TO HIS EXCELLENCY

GEORGE Marquis of BUCKINGHAM,

*Lord Lieutenant General and
General Governor of IRELAND.*

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

THE following sheets are addressed to you as the Representative of the *Defender of the Faith*. They were compiled chiefly for your information. The attempt made under the regency of your Predecessor, to subvert the Established Religion, by a set of men under the denomination of White-Boys, you must have heard of. But the daring outrages, and bloody acts attending that attempt, you must unavoidably be a stranger to, or must be acquainted with by imperfect report. For this reason, My Lord, the account of those transactions, and the arguments adduced by the friends,

friends, and by the enemies of our Church Establishment, in their respective publications on that atrocious design, are here collected, with such original strictures as were necessary to connect them in a regular chain of argument. If your Lordship should think proper to peruse them, you will by knowing how, and by whom the attack is made, be enabled the more effectually to exert the power delegated to you, by our Sovereign, in defence of that Church, which by inclination, as well as by his Coronation Oath he is bound to defend.

I am,

With due deference and respect,

Your EXCELLENCY'S

Most obedient and

Most humble servant,

CANDIDUS.

To the real Friends,
WHETHER IN OR OUT OF PARLIAMENT,
Of our excellent Constitution,
CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS.

THIS pamphlet, primarily intended for the information of our Chief Governor, will be found upon perusal to be equally interesting to you. For as Swift, in his project for the advancement of religion, remarks, that *the most violent party-men, are such as in the conduct of their lives have discovered the least sense of religion or morality*; we find that whatever reason the party-zealots of those days may have given for this censure, there is but little room to compliment the mass of partisans in our days, upon any progress or improvement in their moral and religious principles, as far, at least, as they can be collected from their conduct and writings, especially in the interesting cause which is the subject of the following pages.

It is neither new nor uncommon, that there should be two sides to a question; and that there should be such a division of sentiments in men, as to incline some of them to one side in preference to another. But it is very new and very uncommon, to find men
of

of religious principles as diametrically opposite as light is to darkness, and also men under the profession of episcopal Protestants, united in one leading principle, that of *defaming*, *degrading* and *dispoliating* the Established Clergy, upon the plea of humbling their pride, curbing their ambition, and cheating their avarice; as if these principles were the distinguishing features in an Established Ecclesiastick above every other denomination of men.

I own it is not fair to charge any set of men with designs that they publicly disavow, by their loud professions of indulgence to every religious bias, though none are so loud in those professions as these who shew the least indulgence under the prevalence of power. The Established Church, indeed, has given demonstrative proof of her tolerant principles; whilst the return she meets from her Dissenting brethren, is not only abuse and persecution, but publicly avowed wishes, and privately meditated attempts to sap her foundations, and tumble her into ruins.

THE plausible pretence for this is an alleviation of miseries of the peasantry by the abolition of Tithes, and a pretended wish for a commutation; than which nothing can be further from their thoughts, many of those Dissenters publicly declaring that they do not wish for a commutation, because
lessening

lessening the evil of an establishment would be a means of making it the more permanent: And yet that the professed friends of the Established Church, should be so divested from her interest by assertions directly opposite to reason and experience, as to contribute to the beggary of her Clergy, is such a paradox in piety, as is not to be met with in any other religious system upon earth.

No doubt on't, there are many among the representatives of the people, and among the people themselves, who in heart as well as in profession, are the sincere friends of our Episcopal Church, who would start at the apprehensions of an injury, and resent any insult thrown upon her, and are ready at all times to defend her pre-eminence, and support her Clergy against all opposers. But what does all this zeal signify, if they suffer it to lie dormant, and under the plea of philanthropy, give up the subsistence of the Clergy to the clamours, not only of men who would extirpate them if they could, but of men who would give up all religion rather than contribute to the support of any, and to whom a commutation of any kind will be equally burdensome and offensive provided it bears any proportion to the present Establishment.

THE Dean above quoted, who was eminent for patriotism and philanthropy, and was no religious bigot, in his *Sentiments of a Church*

Church of England man, distinguishes him by some characteristicks, which from the superior understanding of the Author deserve the attention of those who wish to be considered as such. Take them therefore in his own words:

“ *A Church of England man* has a true veneration for the scheme established among us of Ecclesiastical government, and though he will not determine whether Episcopacy be of Divine right, he is sure it is most agreeable to primitive institution, fittest of all others for preserving order and purity, and under its present regulations best calculated for our civil state: He should therefore think the abolishment of that order among us would prove a mighty scandal and corruption of our faith, and manifestly dangerous to our Monarchy; nay, he would defend it by arms against all the powers upon earth, except our own Legislature, in which case he would submit as to a general calamity, a dearth or a pestilence.”

“ SECTS in a state seem only tolerated with any reason, because they are already spread, and because it would not be agreeable with so mild a Government, or so pure a religion as ours, to use violent methods against numbers of mistaken people, while they do not manifestly endanger the constitution of either. For these reasons the
Church

Church of England man is for tolerating such different forms in religious worship as are already admitted, but is by no means for leaving it in the power of those who are tolerated, to advance their own models upon the ruin of what is already established; which it is natural for all sects to desire, and which they cannot justify by any consistent principles if they do not endeavour; and yet which they cannot succeed in without the utmost danger to the publick peace."

"To prevent these inconveniencies, a *Church of England man* thinks it highly just, that all rewards of trust, profit or dignity, which the State leaves in the disposal of the Administration, should be given only to those whose principles direct them to preserve the constitution in all its parts. For the maxim that no man should on the account of conscience be deprived of the liberty of serving his country, is a topick which may be equally applied to admit Papists Atheists, Mahometans, Heathens and Jews. If the Church wants members of its own to employ in the service of the publick, or be so unhappily contrived as to exclude from its communion such persons who are likeliest to have great abilities; it is time it should be altered, and reduced to some more perfect form: But in the mean time it is not altogether improbable that when those who dislike the constitution, are so very zealous in their offers for the service of their country; they are not wholly

wholly unmindful of their party or of themselves."

"THE Dutch whose practice is often quoted to prove and celebrate the great advantages of a general liberty of conscience, have yet a national religion professed by all who bear office among them. But why should they be a precedent for us either in Religion or Government? But (admitting them to be so) I will suppose any of the numerous sects in Holland to have so far prevailed, as to have raised a civil war, destroyed the Government and Religion, and put their Administrators to death; after which I will suppose the people to have recovered all again, and to have settled on their old foundation. Then I would put a query,—Whether that sect, which was the unhappy instrument of all this confusion, could reasonably expect to be trusted for the future with the greatest employments; or indeed to be hardly tolerated among them?"

"A *Church of England* man does not see how that mighty passion for the Church which some men pretend can well consist with those indignities and that contempt they bestow on the persons of the Clergy; which, besides the disgrace to the Reformation, and to Religion itself, casts an ignomy upon the kingdom, that it doth not deserve. We have no better material to compound the Priesthood of, than the mass of mankind, which corrupt as it is, those
who

who receive orders must have some vices to leave behind them when they enter into the Church, and if a few do still adhere, it is no wonder, but rather a greater one that they are no worse; therefore he cannot think ambition or the love of power more justly laid their charge than to other men, because that would be to make religion itself, or at least the best constitution of Church government answerable for the errors and depravity of human nature."

"THE common libellers in their invectives, tax the Church with an insatiable desire of power and wealth (equally common to all bodies of men as well as individuals) but it is worthy observing the justice of parties; the sects among us are apt to complain, and think it hard usage to be reproached now after fifty years for overturning the state; for the murder of the King, and the indignity of a usurpation, and yet these men and their partisans are continually reproaching the Clergy, and laying to their charge the pride, the avarice, the luxury, the ignorance of Papists' times for a thousand years past."

"WHEN a schism is once spread in a nation there grows at length a dispute who are the schismatics, without entering on the arguments used by both sides among us, to fix the guilt on each other; it is certain, that in the sense of the law, the schism lies on that
side

side which oppose itself to the religion of the state. I have it among the Divines to dilate upon the danger of schism as a spiritual evil, but I would consider it as a temporal one ; and I think it clear that any great separation from the Established worship, although to a new one, that is more pure and perfect, may be an occasion of endangering the public peace, because it will compose a body always in reserve, prepared to follow any discontented heads, upon the plausible prettexts of advancing true religion and opposing error, superstition and idolatry. For this reason, Plato lays it down as a maxim, that *men ought to worship the gods according to the laws of the country*, and he introduceth Socrates in his last discourse, utterly disowning the crime laid to his charge of *teaching new Divinities or modes of worship*. Thus the poor Hugonots of France were engaged in a civil war, by the specious pretences of some who under the guise of religion, sacrificed many thousand lives to their own ambition and revenge. Thus was the whole body of Puritans in England, drawn to be instrumental, or abettors of all manner of villainy, by the artifices of a few men whose designs from the first were levelled to destroy the constitution both of religion and government. And thus even in Holland itself, where it is pretended that the variety of Sects live so amicably together, and in such perfect obedience to the Magistrate,

trate, it is notorious how a turbulent party joining with the Armenians, did in the memory of our fathers attempt to destroy the liberty of that republic. So that upon the whole where sects are tolerated in a state, it is fit they should enjoy full liberty of conscience, and every other privilege of free-born subjects *to which no power is annexed*. And to preserve their obedience upon all emergencies, a government cannot give them too much ease, nor trust them with too little power."

"THE Clergy are usually charged with a persecuting spirit; which they are said to discover by an implacable hatred to all Dissenters, and this appears to be more unreasonable, because they suffer less in their interests by a toleration than any of the conforming laity: For while the Church remains in its present form, no Dissenter can possibly have any share in its dignities, revenues or power; whereas by once receiving the sacrament, he is rendered capable of the of the highest employments in the State. And it is very possible that a narrow education together with a mixture of human frailty may help to beget among some of the Clergy in possession such an aversion and contempt for all innovators, as physicians are apt to have for empiricks, or lawyers for pettifoggers, or merchants for pedlars; but since the number of sectories does not concern

cern the Clergy either in point of interest or conscience (it being an evil not in their power to remedy) its more fair and reasonable to suppose their dislike proceeds from the dangers they apprehend to the peace of the common wealth, in the ruin whereof they must expect to be the first and greatest sufferers."

I HAVE now from the authority of that memorable patriot, profound politician, and acute reasoner, the Dean of St. Patrick's, exhibited the sentiments of a *Church of England man* in his days, when the two Dissenting sects (*Papists and Presbyterians*) observed (at least externally) a passive subordination to the Established Church, and were perfectly amenable to the laws supporting that establishment. Surely then the same sentiment should govern the true friends of the Church of Ireland, now she is attacked by those communities, and ready to fall a victim to the avowed discontent, publick slander, and machinations of the one, and to the hereditary antipathies, mercenary depredations, and savage barbarities of the other. And these sentiments when fixed, it is hoped, will produce a steady resolution to defend her interest and support her Clergy at the expense of their lives and fortunes.

CANDIDUS.

A

FULL DISPLAY, &c.

THE public attention has been of late so much engaged on the subject of Tithes, and the disturbances prevailing in the Southern provinces of this kingdom, attributed to them; and the arguments that have appeared for and against them being so complicate, and detached from each other in different pamphlets, rendering it difficult to judge with precision on which side the strength of reasoning, and the power of truth prevail most, I have been led to peruse the several publications with attentive impartiality. Some of them I find wrote with dignity of sentiment, perspicuity of language, and strength of argument; whilst others, defective in those points, have recourse to quibbles and declamation; and by scoffs and scurrility, endeavour to draw the public eye from the mischief brooding against the Establishment by the plastick genius of opponent Sectaries, who insidiously represent the dangers complained of as existing only in the causeless apprehensions and terrified imaginations of interested and injured Ecclesiasticks.

B

I MEAN

I MEAN not to be considered here as an Author; for he who collects the arguments of other men, in order to place them in an obvious view before the publick, cannot, from the nature of the undertaking, assume that title. All the merit I can plead must arise from the separation of what is instructive from what is insignificant; what tends to inform from what is calculated to abuse the judgment; or, in two comprehensive words, the *Utile* from the *Futile*; like the bee who culls the honey from the choicest flowers, whilst he neglects the weeds and rubbish of the garden. My endeavours shall be not only to select the best arguments made use of by the respective opponents, but to dispose them in such a method, and order, as may illustrate the subject, and inform the reader, better than he could be from the dispersed and prolix passages which are to be found in the respective originals. And in doing this I shall take the liberty to throw in some strictures of my own, not only to connect the sentimental links into a regular chain of reasoning, but to expose all deficiency or fallacy of argument; being determined to throw off all reserve, or hesitation, in exalting truth above the power of prejudice and chicanery.

THE pamphlets that I shall chiefly take notice of are six, and those are the Bishop of Cloyne's, Theophilus, and Counsellor Trant's, on the one side; and Mr. O'Leary, Dr. Campbell, and Mr. Barber's, on the other. There are other opponents to the Bishop, but they are too empty, trifling and scurrilous for a serious comment; though they shall not be totally overlooked in our survey of this business.

THE Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet, tho' not the first in point of time, yet from the dignity of the Author,
and

preservation of general harmony, should rest in oblivion, his Lordship very pathetically laments the necessity that has driven him to recall past grievances, and by that means to excite jealousies amongst fellow-citizens. But, for my part, I see no necessity for such an apology; or for using any reserve to people who are not very squeamish in saying what they please, with as little respect to persons as to truth, when they think it will serve their cause, and who in many instances have but ill requited the Bishop for his delicacy. Truth, being the detector of enormities, and a protector against them, should upon all occasions be exhibited in her primitive blaze, and displayed as a beacon to caution the careless, and admonish the unwary.

THE Bishop likewise hopes that the candour of the two dissenting Communions will not impute his reflections on the political operations of their respective tenets to the want of a Christian spirit of toleration. But vain were his Lordship's hopes! Instead of candour, he has been treated with unmerited reproaches, and the abusive pens of both parties have been let loose upon him. Low sarcasm, and malevolent invectives, have been opposed to the most irrefragable arguments, cloathed in the mildest as well as the purest language. All which, with a conscious integrity, he has treated as the *Mala Gaudia Mentis*, which is Virgil's paradoxical characteristick of Infernals.

BUT it is time to come to particulars.

Mr. O'Leary introduces his answer to the Bishop by a controversial craft, generally made use of to cover a defect of reasoning; and that is by advancing arguments foreign to the subject, and producing the
records

records of ancient partizans, to palliate, if not to justify, offences against existing statutes.

THIS Introduction is made up of common-place historical phrases and facts, that have as little reference to the Bishop of Cloyne's plain narrative of the Munster outrages, as they would have had with Gavin's Master-Key of Popery, had they been placed at the head of it.

He begins by telling us, that *an historian should be devoid of hope, fear, or prejudice; should not confine himself to the recital of actions, without laying open the hearts of the actors, the secret springs which moved them to the enterprize, and the final issues of them. That he should attribute no bad motives to persons, whose actions could bear a favourable construction. That he should admit no figures in his historical group, but figures of the great and illustrious.* All which, whether pertinent or impertinent, right or wrong, the Bishop of Cloyne has nothing to do with; and is calculated only to fill up a vacancy of reasoning.

The Bishop had no intention to write the history of a Rabble; his design was to lay their outrages before the Legislature, authenticated by uncontrovertible evidence. The principles from whence they took their rise, he very naturally supposed to be the *principles* of Popery, perfectly well known in all Protestant countries, and fatally experienced in these dominions. Their *final issues* he did not choose to wait for, as it might then be too late to redress the calamity, well knowing that a breach, which might be prevented by the vigilance of a sentinel, may require the force of an army to defend and repair.

As for *laying open the hearts of the actors*, that must be left to the Popish Clergy, who are enabled, by
auricular

auricular confessions, to penetrate the secrets of their flocks. The Bishop has no other way of knowing the heart but by the actions of men. If he sees a rabble direct their rage against a particular body of men, he can have no doubt but the ruin of the one is intended by the other : nor will the effect be the less dreadful from the shabbiness of the agents. Had the gunpowder-plot taken effect, the carnage would have been visible, though the author of the explosion had been invisible ; so that ignorance of the secret springs of action does not take from the atrocity of it.

THE Bishop charges these outrages upon a *Popish mob* ; Theophilus calls them a *Popish banditti* ; and Counsellor Trant makes them *an assemblage of the lower orders of Roman Catholics* ; and though these assertions are supported by the circumstances of the place, and the mode of association being at their Mass-Houses, and by oaths at the foot of their altars, and also by the publick declarations of the insurgents, who profess themselves Roman Catholics ; yet Mr. O'Leary opposes this evidence, by saying, he must take the liberty of differing in opinion from the Bishop in regard to their being a *Popish mob* *, and says, *if the Bishop had done justice to all parties, he would have discovered several of his own sheep amongst the speckled flock of insurgents ; for a Clergyman, who was also a Magistrate of the county of Kerry, had declared that many Protestants (though of the lower order) were engaged in tendering oaths, in processions by day, and outrages by night.* All this may be very true, without altering the complexion of the mob ; for a few of the

* Mr. O'Leary's words are as follow,—I shall take the liberty of differing in opinion from Bishop Burnet. The pamphlet alluded to, and which Mr. O'Leary has taken for a precedent, was by order of Government in the year 1707 publicly burned by the common hangman.

lower order of the Established Church joining the insurgents, no more alters their denomination, than the mixed multitude that marched with the Israelites out of Egypt prevented them from being a congregation of Israelites; or than a few Hibernians incorporated in a Highland Regiment can alter the title of the regiment.

BUT Mr. O'Leary says, *it is the crime and not the religion of the criminal that disturbs the peace of society.* But surely if religion be the cause of the crime, by a prudent restraint on the cause, the crime may be prevented. It is true an individual suffers no more by being robbed by a Roman Catholick, than he would, had a Protestant committed the fact; but the case is quite different in respect to Government, by whom all crimes should be treated in a double respect, not only as committed against individuals, but as committed against the State, or Constitution at large. If a Protestant bearing arms commits an outrage upon a fellow-subject, he becomes liable to the penalties annexed to the crime. But if a Roman Catholick does the same, he becomes not only liable to the penalties annexed to the particular crime, but he subjects himself to the law which renders it penal in a Roman Catholick to bear arms. So that Mr. O'Leary's plea of Protestants mixing with Catholics, though advanced with design to palliate the offence, can have no influence upon Government, who must consider the Catholics as offenders in a double capacity. Or in other words, whilst he means to shew that the villainy is not altogether Popish, he shews at the same time that the Papists are the most audacious offenders.

Mr. O'Leary charges the Bishop with saying, *That the Church of Ireland is at this present moment in immi-*
nent

ment danger of subversion from the Dissenters ready to pull down an ecclesiastical establishment, and the Catholics ready to set up their own. But his Lordship says no such thing. He says that *the Dissenters of Ireland differ from their brethren in Scotland, Holland, &c. as they reject the idea of a national church. That they are independents in a civil view, consequently that their principles tend to pull down, contrary to those of the Roman Catholics, which tend to set up an ecclesiastical establishment.* And surely that can be no obloquy which is the glory and boast of both religions. But had the Bishop expressed himself as Mr. O'Leary here represents, though it would be deviating from the precaution he had prescribed to himself, perhaps it would not be deviating from the truth, however the publick harmony might be injured by bringing it to publick notice. But nothing can libel a cause so much as to make truth injurious to its interest.

THE Bishop having identified the insurgents, the next point necessary to the completion of his plan is to mark their progress. And here we have a manifest demonstration of a design against the lives and properties of the Established Clergy, planned with artifice, carried on by system, and executed with barbarity.

I SHALL lay before you the particular instances exhibited by his Lordship.

No fewer than eleven acts of violence and cruelty have been committed in the diocese of Cloyne. The first a Dignitary of the Cathedral, forced out of his house at midnight, and with a gun pointed to his head, and a horse produced with a saddle full of spikes on which he was to be mounted, if he refused to swear to give up his legal rights. The second
menaced

menaced with the most horrible reception, if he did not more punctually obey their edicts, though his fears had led him before this publicly to declare his submission to them. A third threatened with the most horrid imprecations to be treated inhumanly and barbarously on the same account. A fourth prohibited from officiating with threats of severe punishment. A fifth compelled to discontinue a law-suit by the same threats. A sixth threatened to have his house burned if he persisted to oppose their edicts. A seventh had his house broke open at midnight, and his bedchamber entered by a number of armed men, who forced him to give up his horses to their use. An eighth narrowly escaped a visit from 300 men, having just quitted his residence before their arrival. A ninth had his house surrounded in the dead of the night by a body of men, who endeavoured to force his gates, the terror of which had nearly occasioned the death of his daughter, who had been brought to bed but the night before. A tenth received a written message from the White-Boys, declaring with their usual imprecations, that if he intended such villainy as to set Tithes at the old rates, they had prepared a pitched shirt for him, in which they would set him on fire. The eleventh, a gentleman more respectable for his character than his very advanced age, after forty-four years residence in his parish, where he had been a constant benefactor to the poor, received repeated messages threatening the burning of his house, and violence to his person, and was protected only by a military guard from these ruffians, three hundred of whom advancing to his house, but hearing that it was guarded by soldiers, thought the attack too dangerous.

SEVERAL instances are also produced from the diocese of Cork ; and the whole of the Clergy in that extensive

extensive county were under continual alarm, and obliged to arm themselves in the best manner they could; but this precaution not being sufficient for their security, they were obliged to yield to the violence of the insurgents, to avoid those graves that were in many places dug for their reception.

BUT all this is a matter of amusement to Mr. O'Leary, who, like the Heathens of old, after cloathing the primitive Christians in bear-skins, and setting their dogs upon them, looked on their sufferings with horrid satisfaction. This gentleman, it seems, thinks that threatenings, prohibitions and robberies, are too insignificant to be denominated persecution, or considered as a design to overthrow the Established Church: As if stoning the Clergy in the act of divine worship, and threatening to murder them if they demanded what was set apart by Government for their subsistence, was not the most effectual method of driving them from their parishes, and of sending their religion after them. The Bishop's general account of the insurrections in Munster is therefore called by Mr. O'Leary a *Mountain delivered of a Mouse*: For nothing, it seems, but actual cutting of throats, deserves the name of persecution in the opinion of a Popish Ecclesiastick.

BUT let us see Mr. O'Leary's detail of outrages committed by *Captain Right's forces*, as he calls them.

“ THEY collected money in two or three places for the support of their confederates who were in gaol. There was one man cruelly and barbarously murdered in the county of Tipperary. There was a respectable Clergyman of the Established Church (the Rev. Mr. Ryan) most cruelly used. The Rev. Mr.
Hare

Hare was waylaid and escaped. In the county of Cork, the Rev. Dr. Atterbury was forced to swear to the Right-Boys Table of Tithe Rates; but received no injury. The Rev. Mr. Mayne had some of his out-houses burned. The Rev. Mr. Kenny, from terror quitted his habitation. And Archdeacon Tisdal, with Father Burke the Priest of the parish, took shelter in Cork. The Rev. Mr. Brown had two or three horses cropped. These, says Mr. O'Leary, are the Clergymen of the Established Church who were most materially injured; for in the long space of fifteen months, whilst the disturbances continued, until the present Earl of Carhampton came to Munster, I have heard of no murder committed by the White Boys. Such is Mr. O'Leary's account of these disturbances, which gives him room for another sneer at the Bishop's general account, which he says *might be inclosed in a nut-shell, of which five or six Protestant Clergymen were the kernel*. By which he plainly intimates, that nothing can dignify the historick page but such a general massacre as the Protestants experienced in this kingdom in the year 1641.

NEVER were sophistry and falsehood strained to a greater pitch than we find them by the advocates for these disturbers of the publick peace, amongst whom Mr. O'Leary has taken the lead, and is the most ingenious in suggesting every surmise that may palliate, or in finding out the most deceptive colouring to shade those enormities. *The smoky crib—the tattered garment—the naked offspring*, are artfully blended in a picture of misery; and the sufferings of a wretched peasantry, under the oppressions of the Established Clergy and their Tax-gatherers (as the Proctors are called) are exhibited to give their violence the colour of redressing the grievances of injured humanity.

LET us hear this self-created mouth of Popery.

CLARENDON (says he) asserted that in the reign of Charles the First, the Papists were mostly the common-place, and the butt against which all the arrows were directed. Now if this observation has any meaning in it, it must be this; "the Papists of the present reign are as innocent, and yet suffer as unjustly in the opinion of their fellow-subjects, as they did under the reign of the first Charles;" all which may be readily admitted, and yet reflect no great credit on their principles. But by whom, I would ask, were the Papists made *the butt*? Were they not the fanaticks of those days? The Independents

Who thought the further they retired
From Rome, the more they were inspired.

Whose brethren in principles Mr. O'Leary is now cajoling as fellow-sufferers, and considering as friendly allies in the war which has been proclaimed against the Establishment.

As a further apology for this *motley group of insurgents*, (as he calls them) who he was apprehensive would be made a Popish confederacy, he insinuates the exaggerating principle of common fame, and the difficulty of coming at an original picture, from the false daubing of political Limners, who give the Catholics such colours, as would represent them to Government in the most abhorrent light. And to shew how far men are misled by report, he mentions a ridiculous report of the arrival of eight hundred Jesuits mounted on dromedaries in the reign of Charles the Second. This piece of *shoe-boy's wit* degrades him in the republick of letters: Besides, the art of exhibiting hyperbolical reports, to weaken the credit of plain unexaggerated facts, is become too trite
a device

a device to fascinate any but the most vulgar intellects. It is a piece of generalship in a literary, resembling that of a military antagonist, which draws the attention of the besieged from the place of danger, by making a bustle and parade where there is no design to attack. Thus Mr. O'Leary, by quoting the absurd report of *Jesuits mounted on dromedaries*, would insinuate that the White-Boy rabble was equally the offspring of low buffoonery, and fostered only by timid apprehensions.

AND in respect to the false colouring of political Limners, I must observe that Government stands in no need of a modern Limner to give them a just portrait of a true Catholick. It has been handed down to them in bloody colours, by the best masters of that persuasion in different ages; every feature of which (when viewed in a religious light) carries in it an aspect so horrid as to appal the senses, and fill the mind with jealousy and dread. And though there may be many whose natural dispositions are too good to be spoiled by the avowed tenets of their religion, yet these are so few in comparison of the many who are persuaded of their righteousness, and would glory in obeying them, that it can be no wonder to find Protestants alarmed at every act of violence offered by Popish insurgents to their Church and Clergy. Nor will any thing that can be said by Mr. O'Leary, or by any private Pastor of the Church of Rome, whose innate philanthropy, stifled in their juvenile days, but revived by maturity of reason, and an education among Protestants, remove this distrust, till those persecuting tenets are disavowed as publickly as they have been, and still are, avowed under the ascendancy of that Church.

BUT his contrasting himself with the Bishop of Cloyne in regard to interested views, is too insulting
to

to be passed over unnoticed. *The Bishop* (says he) *may rest satisfied that I never intended to sow sedition from a rapacious view to his ecclesiastical revenues. I can frankly say with Parson Adams to his brother Trulliber, I have no call to your Tithe-pigs, having renounced every claim to Tithes by my sacred vows.* But has he renounced (I ask) those sacred vows which he made to maintain the doctrine and promote the interest of the Church of Rome? And has that Church renounced her tenet of keeping no faith with Hereticks, and her maxim of absolving and rewarding those who stick at no measures either covertly or openly to extend her pale, and propagate her faith? If she has, it becomes Mr. O'Leary to shew when this happy reform took place, and who the Pope was, or where and when the General Council sat that exploded that doctrine. As the mouth of the Catholick Church, he takes upon him to reprobate that tenet; but there are higher authorities than him who still maintain and support it; and there are lower authorities too who have lately reduced it to practice.

It is worthy of observation, that the Bishop does not so much as mention Mr. O'Leary's name from the beginning to the end of his pamphlet, except in the postscript, where his Lordship, without intending to justify, makes a slight apology for Theophilus for saying that *agitating Fryars and Romish Missionaries have been sent hither on purpose to sow sedition.* His terms as well as reasoning (says the Bishop) *I shall leave to Theophilus to defend, (observing only that a strong conviction of the truth, and apprehensions for the safety of religion, will naturally excite a warmth, from which indifference is a sure exemption) and I leave it likewise to him (Theophilus) to make good the assertion that agitating Friars and Romish Missionaries have been sent hither*
for

for the purpose of sowing sedition. But though I do not know on what authority Theophilus speaks, I can very well conceive, that he may think the letters of Mr. O'Leary calculated to sow sedition. I do not say that the Rev. Author intends, much less that he is sent hither on purpose, but in my poor opinion, (which has however the sanction of every rational man with whom I have conversed on the subject) his publications tend (and if such were his design are most artfully contrived) to produce that effect. Here we see the candour of the Divine, and the courtesy of the Gentleman, which Mr. O'Leary treats with oblique sneers, and even direct reproaches on his Lordship.

I know not (says Mr. O'Leary) upon what grounds the Lord Bishop of Cloyne can say that my addresses are most artfully contrived to sow sedition. Is it for recommending peace? Is it for recommending patience under sufferings? No. If so, the Lord Bishop of Cloyne must burn his Bible. Is it because I did not enlarge upon the miseries of the peasantry, in consequence of low wages and rack rents? No; I say, it is not because these addresses are interlarded with the advice of patience under oppressions, and precaution in violating the laws; but it is because these oppressions are attributed to the dues of the Clergy, and because it is insinuated that those dues are established by partial and severe laws; and that those laws, notwithstanding their partiality and injustice, will be supported by the logic of Crown Lawyers, the perjuries of witnesses, and the prejudices of Juries: And, as an instance in point, because a man who was to be an evidence against some of these miscreants, is characterised as one of the greatest villains in the kingdom, who deserved the gallows some years ago. If this is not incentive language, I don't know what can be called so. The oily epithets of patience and resignation, under the persuasion of
being

being partially oppressed by Government, serve only to inflame the passions of a rabble, and lead them to acts of desperation.

To tell a mob (in plain language) that their distresses are beyond the power of human nature to bear, and that they would be justified by the law of nature in seeking that redress from themselves, which they were not likely to obtain from the Government, and that they were very justifiable in persecuting by fire and sword the Established Clergy, as the Authors of their calamities. Such oratory as this might be suitable enough to a person educated in a Munster cabin; but it would be too bare-faced and dangerous for a man who has been trained in the monastick chicane of a Gallick seminary, where *Ars celandi artem* is a favourite maxim, and one of the principal studies.

I HAVE seen a letter from one of these adepts so artfully worded, that by reading it line after line it exhibited the most amiable character of a man, and yet by reading only every second line it made him the most consummate villain. I have seen a letter also recommending a reputed Heretick to mercy, which by altering the stops condemned him to the flames. And Mr. O'Leary himself has given us an example of an infidel's overturning the evidence of the Resurrection by altering the stops, and adding a note of interrogation in the very text that proclaims it.

Does not this shew that an address may be so worded as to inflame, and at the same time appear as discountenancing a rabble? Certainly it may; and though the Bishop did not positively charge Mr. O'Leary with any such design, but left the addresses to carry with

with them their own conviction, it was a compliment that many are now convinced was undeservedly bestowed.

THE Bishop, indeed, observes that Mr. O'Leary in his addresses to the insurgents conceives them to be of his own religious persuasion at that time assembled in numerous armed bodies, for the avowed purpose of robbing the Established Clergy of their rights. That the rates for Tithes fixed by the Insurgents (though not one-fourth of the value) are said by Mr. O'Leary *to be moderate, founded on their poverty, and the oppressive manner of collecting them.* That after painting their distresses and misery as unexampled, and sympathizing with them in their misfortunes, which he imputes wholly to the Established Clergy, and the persons employed by them, he excites them to prevail on their landlords to present their memorial of grievances to their friends in Parliament, that they might obtain redress from the Legislative power.—Redress of what? (let me ask) Redress from paying Tithes to be sure; for as for rack rents, Mr. O'Leary did not choose to take any notice of them, well knowing that the landlords would not lay the distresses of the people on that score before the Parliament; neither would the Parliament attend to a memorial for the diminution of rents. But that of depriving the Clergy of their legal dues, was neither unprofitable nor unprecedented; a former House of Commons curtailed them very amply, but left room for further retrenchments, and it was hoped that the present House would imitate so righteous an example.

THE Bishop moreover observes, that after the insurgents had proceeded to regulate wages and hearth-money, to controul Magistrates, and to deprive landlords of their rents, Mr. O'Leary in his

third letter to the White-Boys, being apprehensive of the danger that must arise to them from such proceedings, becomes more warm in his expostulations. He asks them, *if they could be so devoid of common sense as to imagine that such a conduct was the best method of deserving the attention and compassion of their Rulers? That such a measure must have been suggested by some artful incendiary, either to cause some confusion in the State, or from an expectation of obtaining a reward for swearing away their lives at the next Assizes.* This incendiary, Mr. O'Leary seems to have in his eye, by saying he had served a twelvemonth's apprenticeship to licentiousness. But who this supposed miscreant could be, and of what religious persuasion he is, the reader is left to his own conjectures to settle. But Mr. O'Leary advises the insurgents to desist from those measures, and *not to force their Rulers to forget in the magnitude of their offences (that is in their intended regulations of hearth-money and rents) whatever may be the cause of their complaints.*

HERE you may observe a manifest anxiety in Mr. O'Leary, not only for the danger but for the folly of the insurgents in intermeddling with the taxes of Government, and attempting to reduce the rents, in which they must not only fail of success, but be defeated in their principal plan of ruining the Established Clergy.

CAN it be any wonder then that the Bishop of Cloyne should be jealous of the interests of that Church over which he is appointed an Overseer, thus insidiously attacked by her professed enemies, and that he should suspect the cloven foot lurking under the mantle of Samuel? His Lordship must know, and others should know it also, that many of the Romish Clergy, especially those of the quickest parts, can counterfeit any impression, and shrink them-
selves

selves into any mould to promote the interest of the Church of which they are the sworn friends, as well as adopted sons? Of that Church out of which every true Catholick is persuaded *there is no salvation*, and consequently will break through all restraints of law and all ties of justice to promote her interest and encrease her numbers, when it can be done with the hopes of impunity: A recent instance of which we have had in the case of the Minor Lord Gormanstown, who upon the death of his father has been kidnapt by a Popish Priest, aided by a Popish military officer, who stole him from the place of his nativity, and hurried him into a Popish country, in order to bring him up in the Popish religion. So, upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, parents were robbed of their children with the charitable design to make them good Catholicks. For such zealous services this Church has rewards both temporal and spiritual in abundance to recompence her votaries; and to secure them from any future bad consequences attending hypocrisy and prevarication, if they have but craft sufficient to screen themselves from the penalties of the law. Hence we find some of those Missionaries full of their jokes upon the most sacred ordinances, in order to recommend themselves to the good graces of such as sit loose to all religions: wearing religion as they do their garments, in conformity to the most prevailing fashion, making her the hand-maid of policy and even the butt of ridicule, to divert men from seeing the fiery zealot, under his latitudinarian vizard.*

* Swift in his *arguments against abolishing Christianity* says, that the Jesuits send over Emisaries with instructions to personate themselves Members of the several prevailing Sects amongst us. That they have appeared in the guise of *Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents and Quakers*, according as any of these were most in credit. That Popish Missionaries have not been wanting to mix with the Free-Thinkers, among whom Toland the great oracle of the *Anti-Christians* is an *Irish Priest*, the son of an *Irish Papist*.

LET us now hear what Mr. O'Leary says to exculpate himself from this charge of contributing to inflame the White-Boys, and promote sedition.

These disturbances (says he) took their rise in the diocese of Cloyne; I had never been in that diocese but twice; I had no acquaintance there except the Protestant and Catholick Gentlemen of consequence. And however great my esteem for, and the confidence I repose in them, I am not so divested of common sense as to put myself in their power; it would be a means of losing their esteem. Want of prudence, says Lord Littleton, is oftentimes want of virtue; and I should forfeit my claim to both, if I urged a deluded multitude to their destruction by encouraging them to fly in the face of the established laws, and to deprive any person of the property secured to him by the State.

So much in excuse for himself. Now let us hear what he advances for his friends.

Can any person in his senses presume that the Catholicks of Ireland, after the late indulgence extended to them by the reigning powers, would be so divested of gratitude and common sense as to expose their necks to the chain with which rigorous laws had bound them for so many years?

WHAT futile quibbling is here? Those who consider this as a proof of innocence must be easily persuaded (as indeed most people are) to believe what coincides with their wishes.

Mr. O'Leary has not been charged with any malpractices in the diocese of Cloyne. What has been urged against him is the evil tendency of his addresses to the White-Boys, wherein he says, *I know you are*
oppressed

oppressed and impoverished more than any set of the lower class of people upon earth. And he attributes those distresses (not to rack rents but) to the exactions of the Established Clergy and their Proctors, which has directed the popular fury against those stigmatized oppressors. But his saying that he never encouraged the White-Boys to deprive any person of the property secured to him by the State, is so bare-faced a contradiction to his declaration that their Table of Tithes (though not the fourth part of the property allotted to the Clergy by the State) is moderate, and grounded on their poverty; as demonstrates that some men, under the professions of sincerity, will make no scruple of asserting any thing roundly, upon presumption that so long as it remains unexamined it will pass for truth. Nor is it uncommon to find a Monastick Disciple thus playing fast and loose, with truth to serve a favourite cause.

THE generality of readers accustom themselves to view things very superficially. Caught by the first object, they give themselves no trouble to look further. Thus, impressed with a pathetic description of misery, they consider not whether such misery really exists or not; they suppose the thing, and that is all they want to convince them. Hence it is that artful men, under the appearance of a superior philanthropy, drawing the picture of misery in *Alto Relievo*, (if I may borrow Mr. O'Leary's metaphor) excite the tenderest sensations, and incline the softened heart to the impressions of pity.

I DON'T mean by the above remark to harden men against the impressions of compassion; I wish only to guard them against deception. Mr. O'Leary makes the White-Boys the most oppressed and impoverished people upon earth, and he attributes this superlative
misery

mifery to the dues of the Clergy ; which is not only falfe in refpect to the affigned authors, but it is falfe alfo in refpect to the degree of mifery.

THE injuflice of attributing thefe oppreffions to the dues of the Clergy is demonftrated by Theophilus in the inftance of an acre of potatoes, which he has pitched upon as being the chief food of the Munfter peafantry, and upon which the charge of oppreffion is particularly grounded.

AFTER proving the impoffibility of exaction on the part of the Clergy or their Proctors, he proceeds thus :

“ IT is a fact which cannot be difputed, that the great Landholders fet part of their great farms every year by the acre to the poorer fort of the peafantry to plant potatoes in at the enormous price of eight pounds fterling, and fo ratably for a lefs quantity than an acre. It muft be admitted that no peafant, rating his labour, manure and feed reafonably, can poffibly cultivate an acre of potatoes properly, at lefs coft than that of four pounds, fo that his crop on an acre muft amount in value to the fum of twelve pounds ; otherwife all his pains and labour are loft. But if the crop did not amount to much more, the peafantry would not wafte their time and labour in fo unprofitable an employment. The Clergyman by law is entitled to the tenth of the crop after it is dug from the earth by the cultivator ; and yet the largeft fum I have ever heard to be demanded for an acre of potatoes is twelve fhillings only ; and the price varies in different parifhes from twelve down to five fhillings ; fo that on an average it may be confidently afferted, that no greater fum than feven or eight fhillings by the acre is demanded by the Parfon throughout

throughout the province of Munster, where those Tithes are the principal part of his subsistence since he has been deprived of the Tithe of Agistment."— To this I must beg leave to add, that in the whole province of Ulster the Tithes of potatoes are never demanded; nor would they be demanded in any other province if the Clergy had not been robbed by the rich Grazier in consequence of an unjust vote of a selfish House of Commons.

Now upon this statement of uncontroverted facts let me ask with what propriety Mr. O'Leary charges the Clergy with oppressing the poor peasant by taking eight shillings for the Tithes, and overlooks the landlord who exacts eight pounds for the rent of an acre of potatoes? I agree with Mr. O'Leary that the peasantry, particularly in the Southern provinces of Ireland, are miserable; but that they are more so than in many other countries, I am not willing to believe on Mr. O'Leary's bare word, not only because I have heard, but because I know to the contrary. Misery is a relative term, and can be fixed only by comparison. That the poor in Ireland are miserable when contrasted by the rich is a self-evident truth; and it is equally true in all countries; but to make this remark of any signification, Mr. O'Leary should prove his assertion that they are more miserable than any poor of the same class upon earth; and the true reason of their being so should be assigned.

BUT supposing them to be more miserable than any other poor, why are the Clergy to be stripped for their relief? Or will four shillings an acre for Tithes (according to the White-Boy rates) alleviate the burden of eight pounds an acre for rent? If they will not, why is their misery placed to the account of the Clergy alone, unless it be to subject them to the fury of the enraged miserables?

THE Bishop of Cloyne compares a Tithe Proctor to a Gentleman's Agent, who collects the rent at the expense of his employer. But Mr. O'Leary says the comparison does not hold, because the tenant pays neither more nor less let the farm produce an hundred fold every year. But he forgot to observe that he pays the same rent though the whole crop should be destroyed by inundation or storm, whereas under such a calamity the Clergyman has no demand at all upon the Farmer.

BUT Mr. O'Leary says *the Bishop has in vain attempted to justify Proctors, &c. for the general voice is against them.* But let me ask, from whence he collects this general voice? Is it from the banditti whose cause he is pleading, those ruffians who have risen up (as Theophilus observes) *avowedly for the purpose of rooting out the Established Clergy by fire and sword, whose manifestoes and exploits are daily, with an air of triumph and exultation, circulated in the publick prints?* Or are we to collect it from the curious exhortations and addresses made to those ruffians by the secret enemies of the Establishment, calling themselves friends to the Constitution? Or are we to look for it among the Farmers, whose annual study to defraud, despoil, and circumvent the Clergy, make it absolutely necessary to have recourse to those agents? Or are we to hunt for it among the remaining few (if any are remaining) of those just, religious, and disinterested Senators, who by a vote of their House, without any concurrence of the * *King and Lords*, took upon them to annul the laws of the land, and to de-

* Swift (in his *Contests and Dissentions in Athens and Rome*) says, that in a mixed State great care should be taken to preserve the limits of power deposited with each. That to assume a declarative right, that is to declare an opinion to be law upon any occasion whatever, is little less than to assume the whole power of the Legislature. And that tyranny will rise up with privileges reserved in petto to exert upon occasion, and to serve expedients.

prive the Clergy of part of their legal stipend, in which the poor were neither thought of nor benefited? Amongst these people we may expect *the voice of the enemy and avenger, of the slanderer and blasphemer*, who, perverted by education, by fiery zeal, by a malevolent eye, and an avaricious heart, would destroy the Establishment, and even the whole Christian system, to save the expense of supporting it.

So much for Mr. O'Leary's attempt to apologize for himself. As for what he says in regard to the gratitude of his friends for the indulgence extended to them by the reigning Powers, any body that considers the veneration that the meanest Roman Catholic has for his religion, to which he has been taught to believe the keys of Heaven are annexed, to the exclusion of all other denominations of Christians, will readily believe that gratitude for civil favours can bear no competition in their minds with what appears to them to be not only the interest of Christ, but the interest of the world in general, whose salvation depends upon the prevalence of their Church. Not to observe that he who will risque the putting his neck into a halter for the sake of a few potatoes, will make no scruple of doing the same in the cause of that Church which alone can reward him with eternal glory.

BUT to establish the gratitude of the Roman Catholics, and as a pregnant testimony of their attachment to Government, he mentions their peaceable demeanour in the time of the rebellion in Scotland. *When the Crown* (as Mr. O'Leary chooses to express himself) *tottered on the head of George the Second. When Thurot landed at Carrickfergus. When England was surrounded by a warring world, and a victorious enemy displaying their flag on her coasts.*

BUT let me ask where was the loyalty and where the gratitude of the Roman Catholics, who, though possessed of every advantage both civil and religious
that

that the mildest Government could give them, under the apparent oblivion of former animosities, and the cessation of every discriminate mark of pre-eminence, that of religion only excepted, of which they had the unmolested enjoyment, tho' not of the establishment; when they filled the offices of Sheriffs of Counties, Magistrates of Corporations, and even seats in Parliament: "When under all these privileges and indulgences they rose in rebellion on the 23^d of October 1641, and with the most shocking circumstances of cruelty destroyed in all parts of the kingdom, where they had force sufficient for the execution, men, women and children, without distinction of age or sex, shewing mercy to none but to those of the Popish communion? Where was their loyalty, when in extenuation of this perfidy and cruelty they pleaded a commission from the King to possess themselves of the forts and castles of Ireland, to arrest and seize the estates and persons of the English Protestants, and when taxed with the forgery of this commission, (which by the bye most of the Dissenters in both kingdoms think to be real) declared by the mouth of Lord Muskerry that *it was lawful to pretend what was necessary to the advancement of their cause?* And have the principles of Popery become more lenient since those days, or its professors less violent in their zeal, or less cruel in their disposition, when they can display it unresisted and undetected?*

* The opposition (says Swift) made by the Roman Catholics when they were much more numerous and powerful, when they had a Prince of their own religion to head them, had been trained for some years under a Popish Deputy, and received such mighty aids from the French King, and the ill success attending that opposition, must deter them from similar attempts. He therefore condemns the general cry that Popery is the common enemy against which Protestants in general must unite. It is agreed (says he) among Naturalists that a lion is a larger, a stronger, and more dangerous enemy than a cat; yet if a man were to have his choice, either a lion at his foot, bound fast with three or four chains, his teeth drawn out, and his claws pared to the quick; or an angry cat in full liberty at his throat, he would take no long time to determine.—The application is left to the reader. (Sacramental Test.)

YES,

YES, says Mr. O'Leary, the liberal-minded of all persuasions hold feuds and discontents on the score of religious creeds in the highest contempt. For who could have been more active in suppressing those tumults than my Lord Kenmare, of whose conduct the publick has an honourable testimony in the address of thanks voted to him by the Clergy of the Established Religion.

THIS address of the Established Clergy, signed by so honourable and very respectable a Chairman as the present Dean of Limerick, throws a lustre upon his character which dignifies him more than his title. At the same time it confirms the Bishop of Cloyne's observation, that *men are often better than their tenets*. To which I shall take the liberty of adding, that a liberal education under a Government whose lenient ecclesiastical establishment treats all persuasions with tenderness and toleration, leads men to act upon the principles of gratitude, and to contribute to the tranquillity of that Government under which they enjoy tranquillity themselves. Such men consider that the dignity of Government can never be supported without due submission to the laws. That Protectors demand and deserve some concessions from the protected, who in exchange for the indulgences they receive are obliged to make some sacrifices as well of their wishes as of their interests, and necessarily to forfeit many privileges and advantages which are always annexed to the religion of the State.

BUT is there any room to compliment human nature upon the prevalence of this liberality of sentiments? Not in the least. It was not born with us, but is acquired by education: And what sort of education the Popish peasantry of Ireland have got is too well ascertained from the literary abilities and avowed principles

principles of the generality of their Spiritual Pastors, to give us any well-grounded hopes of finding much of it in that class of men: Mr. O'Leary may flourish away with his sentimental Catholicism; but it is as perfect jargon to his White-Boy friends, as *the Metaphisicks of Quietism or the internal recollection of the mind*. In short, what the Roman Catholicks, taken in the majority, have done, leaves no room to doubt what they are still inclined to do when they have strength and interest, and an opportunity to exert them with a probability of success. Therefore what their conduct was under some circumstances, is no certainty of what their conduct would be under circumstances favourable to their wishes.

THE Bishop of Cloyne observes, that *the idea of increasing the influence of Popery, is revolting to common sense*; and as a proof of its being so, his Lordship mentions the singular system of education of the Roman Catholicks of this country, as well as other peculiar circumstances in their situation. Theophilus likewise observes, *that those who profess the Romish faith are attached to it by the most extraordinary degree of bigotry. That not content with the toleration of their superstition, numbers of them rise up in open rebellion, fall on the Established Clergy, complain that the support settled for them is a publick grievance, and openly demand that this Protestant State shall abridge this maintenance, and consequently root out the Established Religion*. He observes that Popery in this case would become the Established Religion. That not only all the appropriated Tithes, which compose great part of the estates of the Nobility and Gentry, would be wrested out of the hands of those Lay proprietors by the different Societies of Monks and Friars to which they belonged; and that those estates which have been forfeited by repeated acts of rebellion and endeavours

to subvert the Protestant religion, and establish Popery, which estates are mostly now in the hands of Protestants, will be demanded from their present possessors. He moreover observes, that a Protestant Monarch over a Popish people is an absurdity in politics, the principles of Popery teaching that no allegiance is due to Heretick Princes, who may be deposed and murdered by their subjects, as the Pope commanded the English subjects to do to Queen Elizabeth, by his famous Bull of Excommunication, and which Gillini has declared to be defended and maintained by most Catholick nations, and has been often followed in practice by the Apostolick See: And in another place he calls it the *genuine and salutary doctrine of the true Father and Superior Pastor of the Catholicks.*

Mr. O'Leary encounters all this by observing that *there are erroneous opinions among the professed Members of the Church of England and other Protestant Divines*, that therefore the ignorance of an Italian Casuist should not be trumpeted over the three kingdoms as articles of Catholick belief. He says that Gillini confounded the civil with the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. That he imagined the Irish Legislature proposed an oath of allegiance to the Catholicks, binding them to acknowledge the King as Pope and Head of the Universal Church, and the Fountain of all Spiritual authority.

BUT can it be conceived that an Archbishop could be so ignorant as not to know that in all States there is a distinction between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction? Or that he could think that the King of England, without any ecclesiastical orders, could be acknowledged as *Pope and Head of the Universal Church, and the Fountain of all Spiritual Authority?*

IF

principles of the generality of their Spiritual Pastors, to give us any well-grounded hopes of finding much of it in that class of men: Mr. O'Leary may flourish away with his sentimental Catholicism; but it is as perfect jargon to his White-Boy friends, as *the Metaphisicks of Quietism or the internal recollection of the mind*. In short, what the Roman Catholicks, taken in the majority, have done, leaves no room to doubt what they are still inclined to do when they have strength and interest, and an opportunity to exert them with a probability of success. Therefore what their conduct was under some circumstances, is no certainty of what their conduct would be under circumstances favourable to their wishes.

THE Bishop of Cloyne observes, that *the idea of increasing the influence of Popery, is revolting to common sense*; and as a proof of its being so, his Lordship mentions the singular system of education of the Roman Catholicks of this country, as well as other peculiar circumstances in their situation. Theophilus likewise observes, *that those who profess the Romish faith are attached to it by the most extraordinary degree of bigotry. That not content with the toleration of their superstition, numbers of them rise up in open rebellion, fall on the Established Clergy, complain that the support settled for them is a publick grievance, and openly demand that this Protestant State shall abridge this maintenance, and consequently root out the Established Religion*. He observes that Popery in this case would become the Established Religion. That not only all the appropriated Tithes, which compose great part of the estates of the Nobility and Gentry, would be wrested out of the hands of those Lay proprietors by the different Societies of Monks and Friars to which they belonged; and that those estates which have been forfeited by repeated acts of rebellion and endeavours

to subvert the Protestant religion, and establish Popery, which estates are mostly now in the hands of Protestants, will be demanded from their present possessors. He moreover observes, that a Protestant Monarch over a Popish people is an absurdity in politics, the principles of Popery teaching that no allegiance is due to Heretick Princes, who may be deposed and murdered by their subjects, as the Pope commanded the English subjects to do to Queen Elizabeth, by his famous Bull of Excommunication, and which Gillini has declared to be defended and maintained by most Catholick nations, and has been often followed in practice by the Apostolick See: And in another place he calls it the *genuine and salutary doctrine of the true Father and Superior Pastor of the Catholicks.*

Mr. O'Leary encounters all this by observing that *there are erroneous opinions among the professed Members of the Church of England and other Protestant Divines*, that therefore the ignorance of an Italian Casuist should not be trumpeted over the three kingdoms as articles of Catholick belief. He says that Gillini confounded the civil with the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. That he imagined the Irish Legislature proposed an oath of allegiance to the Catholicks, binding them to acknowledge the King as Pope and Head of the Universal Church, and the Fountain of all Spiritual authority.

BUT can it be conceived that an Archbishop could be so ignorant as not to know that in all States there is a distinction between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction? Or that he could think that the King of England, without any ecclesiastical orders, could be acknowledged as *Pope and Head of the Universal Church, and the Fountain of all Spiritual Authority?*

IF

If so, he was ill deserving of his high rank. But in truth he was no such novice; for he plainly distinguishes between them by making their interests distinct. The oath, he calls *an act of Administration*, and represents it as repugnant to the principles of the Catholick religion, unlawful in its extent, invalid in its nature, and not binding on the consciences of men. That religion itself will, by imperceptible degrees, be so weakened, that it will at length perish in the hearts of those Catholicks who should hearken to the fallacious suggestions of the enemies of the Catholick religion (*i. e.* to the civil administration) rather than to the genuine and salutary doctrine of their *true Father and Supreme Pastor*.

HERE I think is a manifest distinction between the State and the Church. And Mr. O'Leary himself endeavours to soften this harsh doctrine, by admitting that the Catholicks of these dominions have two political heads, the one spiritual and the other temporal, which is something like the reprobated attempt of *-serving two masters*, which we have very good authority to be assured is impracticable, especially when their interests are repugnant, as is the case in the article of spiritual supremacy. Those who extend their views to a future life, will always prefer his interest whom they are persuaded can promote their welfare there, before the interest of him from whom they have no expectations either in this life or the next. Hence it is the ruling principle of Popery never to suffer any interest to stand in competition with that of their religion. The obedience due to the Pope is always antecedent to that of the Prince, and where they clash, as they must do when the Prince is a Protestant, the one is always laid aside for the other: And however this may be denied under a Government where the Church of Rome is but tolerated, yet it is demonstrable from the persecution of Hereticks where she has the ascendancy. And
indeed

indeed all the acts and constitutions of their **General Councils**, and all the Bulls and Indulgences of their Popes in their wars and rebellions on account of what they call the Catholick Faith confirm it.

BUT we have a further evidence of the inimical principles of Popery towards a Protestant Prince and State, recorded by Warner in his History of the Irish Rebellion in the year 1641. There he tells us that Rinuccini the Pope's Nuncio, sent into Ireland to conduct the business of that rebellion, in a speech to the Supreme Council at Kilkenny, exhorting them to be faithful to God and the Catholick religion and *the King*, received a reprimand from Cardinal Pamphilio at Rome, for exhorting them to be faithful to an heretical Prince, for that the Holy Roman See would never approve by any positive act, the civil allegiance which any Catholick subjects pay to an heretical Prince. And subsequent to this Rinuccini received another reprimand from Rome, wherein he was told by the same Cardinal Pamphilio, that it had been the constant and uninterrupted practice of that See never to allow her Ministers to make, or consent to publick Edicts of Catholick subjects for the defence of the crown and person of an heretical Prince; adding withal that the Pope declared it was difficult to separate the rites of religion from those which relate to the obedience by Catholicks to a Prince who is an Heretick.

THIS declaration I think may convince any man that there can be no dependance on the sworn allegiance of a Papist to a Protestant Prince, if the See of Rome requires it to be broken, and if the Papist is a true son of that Church.

ANOTHER of Mr. O'Leary's artifices is an endeavour to represent the danger which the Bishop of Cloyne

Cloyne mentions as impending over the Established Church as totally groundless; and this in hopes of throwing Government off their guard, and to prevent their taking any measures for its protection and support. For this purpose he paints the insurgents and their actions in *Chiara obscura*, whilst he represents the fears of the people in the strongest characteristic lines of folly and ridiculous alarms: To accomplish which he has recourse to round assertions, and to all the quirks and subtleties which are essential to the concealment of conspiracies.

Of all the people in the world he is most likely to succeed who pretends to the greatest abhorrence of the crime he purposes to commit. Men are thrown off their guard by this mask of honesty, and are betrayed into security by the smiles of the assassin, who following the advice of Shakespear in all cases of conspiracy,

Hides it in smiles, and affability;
For should he put his native semblance on,
Not Erebus itself were dim enough,
To hide him from prevention.

The distempers of the body politick have for a long time been considered as analogous to those of the body natural; and in nothing with so much propriety as in the effects attending a violence offered to their respective constitutions. To break in upon the health of the human body is often followed by a complication of disorders, which terminate in its dissolution: So innovation in a State sprouts like the Hydra's head into repeated changes, throws it into convulsions, and ends in anarchy.

BUT this artifice of lulling people into security, resembles a practice among Surgeons, who, when they

they have a limb to cut off begin by giving opiates to the patient, to deprive him as much as possible from feeling, and from the apprehensions of what he must suffer. Thus does Mr. O'Leary administer his quieting drafts of misrepresentation to take off the apprehensions of Government, and to give his mob of constitutional quacks the opportunity of cutting to the quick before any struggle is made. One of the methods of stupefaction is that of representing those miscreants as a motley crew of Protestants and Papists, too mean and insignificant to create any dread in the ruling Powers, and proceeding without plan or leader of any importance, must of course die away without any evil consequence to the State.

BUT Mr. O'Leary, who seems to be so well versed in the history of Popish States, by the numerous quotations with which his pamphlet abounds, must know that the insignificance of the insurgents can be no security to Government against an overthrow from their violence. The dreadful calamities brought upon the city of Naples by so mean an instrument as Masianello, is a pregnant proof that a despicable wretch, like an insignificant spark, if neglected, may ravage a State, and bury it in ruins. This Masianello from a fisherman became in a few days, by the assistance of the dregs of the people, so formidable a tyrant as to overwhelm the whole Neapolitan State with anarchy and slaughter; so that those Nobles and Magistrates who would have thought it beneath them at first to correct his insolence with the stocks, suffered under the hands of an executioner, only from his arbitrary fiat; and the few whom he had not time to dispatch trembled at his frown, and held their lives and properties at his mercy.

BUT we need not have recourse to foreign examples to shew how much mischief has sprung from the

D

most

most despicable rioters. We have our Watt, Tyler, Jack Straw, and others of the same desperate insignificance, who were very near overturning the constitution, and would have effected it in all probability, had it not been for the unparalleled courage of the Lord Mayor of London, who killed the rebel in the very act of dictating to the King.

BUT it is not the insignificance of the insurgents only, which is exhibited as a security from any important mischief; but the false alarms are called in as a proof that the supposed danger is founded on the terrors of imagination. Thus a Mr. O'Connor, whose descent from Milesian Monarchs is so carefully recorded (as a minute Historian such as Mr. O'Leary ought to do) with a few servants armed with spades and clubs keeping possession of a litigated spot of land, was (according to Mr. O'Leary's descriptive pen) enlarged into *a mighty Monarch at the head of eighteen thousand well disciplined men, asserting his title to the royalties of his ancestors*, who probably were such Kings as govern the swarthy tribes of America, without shirt, without shoes, or any robes but a bear-skin hanging from their shoulders—Heroes! worthy to be recorded by the pen of an O'Leary.*

SIMILAR to this, and humorous enough, is the account he gives us of a drubbing which a peasant gave an officer for shooting his dog, (*the guardian of his cabin*) which affray stands upon the credit of Mr. O'Leary's round assertion only; but this, it seems, whether true or false, was construed into *Whiteboyism, four hundred of whom were represented as making an attack on the officers of the army near Cork*.

* I should be glad to know if Mr. O'Leary's Bishops derived those superlative excellencies, which he has thought proper to give them, particularly that of *determining the fate of nations and directing the Councils of Kings*, from such Royal Ragamuffins.

So likewise the terror into which some bathing ladies at Monkstown were thrown by some wags *who sounded an old horn in the dead of the night*, was turned (as he affirms) *into a blockade by Captain Right at the head of five hundred men*. I claim not the character of a punster, because I have not a sufficient fund of humour to support it; but I will venture to pronounce that man a *blockhead*, who contrived and hoped to be credited in the report of such a *blockade*.

AND last of all a certain lady *whose tenants wear shoes and stockings*, owing to the encouragement she gives to arts and manufactures, intending to drain part of a lake in order to enlarge her improvements, a grateful peasantry flocked to the work. *It was enough*. Report (by her agent Mr. O'Leary) *forms intrenchments, and a regular encampment of a thousand White-Boys upon the lands of this lady*.

THESE are well painted hyperboles enough; but what do they amount to more than that common report is apt to terrify people, whose memories are full of what their forefathers suffered by a bloody race of bigots, like the frontier inhabitants of America, who are terrified at the slightest alarm, knowing the treachery of their Indian neighbours, whose vengeance, like that of the White-boys, falls on the slumbering innocent, under the cover of midnight obscurity. But will Mr. O'Leary insinuate from this exaggerating principle of fame, that every blast of her trumpet should be considered in the same light as the *old horn* which terrified the water-drinking ladies at Monkstown? It is very proper indeed that the most substantial proofs of an outrage should be produced to those whose business it is to redress them. This convictive evidence has been given to the Legislature. With what propriety therefore does Mr.

O'Leary hope to weaken that evidence by his own bare assertions? If a barn and haggard is burned, and a couple of lives are lost in the flames, and report should swell the account, by involving the mansion-house and all the family in the ruin, does the crime of the incendiary become the less, because the flames were stopped in their progress? Or is it unworthy the Legislature's interference because the mischief was less than it might have been or than report made it to be? The absurdity of such an argument is so glaring that a man must be superior to all the impressions of shame, who can attempt, and hope to influence his readers by it.

THAT there have been burnings, plunderings, maimings and murders is beyond contradiction. Mr. O'Leary himself is obliged (though much against his inclination) to admit and enumerate some of the facts. *But he is hurt (he says) to see every trifling scuffle magnified into rebellion against the State; and every murmur against a Proctor or Tithe Jobber exaggerated into a confederacy against the Church.* So that prowling a neighbourhood in the night, breaking open houses and taking people out of their beds, and burying them up to the chin in pits filled with broken glass and thorns, tearing off the flesh with wool cards, erecting gallowses and hanging some thereon, burning houses, houghing cattle, and raising contributions from the subject, is no rebellion against the State; neither is stoning the Clergy in the act of divine service, and robbing them of their legal subsistence a confederacy against the Church, in Mr. O'Leary's notion of these matters. Nothing short of the progress of a Kett, a Cade, or a Jack Straw so memorable in our English annals, deserves the name of rebellion; and nothing short of the Smithfield fires authorised by that bigoted and bloody Queen Mary, can be deemed a confederacy against the Church, if
Mr.

Mr. O'Leary's opinion of the matter is to pass current.

As for threatenings, Mr. O'Leary makes a perfect ridicule of them. *We little expected* (says he) *a short martyrology of two or three pages announcing threats to burn new Churches which are still standing—Old Churches to be changed into Mass-houses, which have not yet been sprinkled with holy water—The tongues of Clergymen to be cut out, which tongues have not yet lost their spring.* And to shew that these threats were perfectly innocent and free from any design either against the Church or the Clergy, he observes that *no man intent upon the murder of another ever forewarns him of his danger.* By which he means (if he has any meaning at all) to throw an oblique reflection upon the Clergy whose zeal for their religion was so very weak as to yield to threats which were never intended to be executed.

BUT it is no uncommon thing to find the flesh prevailing over the spirit, even amongst those, who, (as Mr. O'Leary tells us) *declared from their altars that it was for the sanctification of their own souls, and those of their flocks, and not for the sake of any worldly emolument that they took orders ; and that nothing should hinder them from going night and day to their assistance, whilst they had strength to perform their functions.*—These disinterested and undaunted professions (if really and sincerely made) shew that the Popish Clergy of our days are superior in Spirituals to their brethren of a few years standing, as is evident from the following circumstance.

THERE are certain members in the human body calculated for the procreation of children, and which those who are restrained from that act can do very well

well without, and much better than the Clergy can do without their tongues. It was therefore once agitated in Parliament that all the Popish Clergy in these realms should be curtailed of those members, which they could not use consistent with their vows of *celibacy and chastity*. This, though mentioned in the House by some jocular wag, without any intention to make it *one of the penal laws*, so terrified the Ecclesiasticks, that hundreds of them fled from the supposed intended operation. And I will venture to affirm, that if such an act had but a second reading in the House, it would set some of those very zealous professors of pastoral attachment a scampering as fast, as the edicts of Capt. Right's Senators have done by the Established Clergy. And I am of opinion, that Mr. O'Leary would not consider it in the same innocent and harmless light that he does the threats to cut out the tongues of the Protestant Clergy; but rather as a premeditated design, and the most effectual method to send all the Popish Priests out of the realm, and with them the Popish religion of course.

It is very certain that *no man intending to murder another will forewarn him of his danger*. But this does not overthrow the Bishop of Cloyne's assertion that notice had been sent to some of the Clergy to forewarn them of their danger; neither does it shew that there was no evil intention towards them. Amongst a band of villains intent upon murder there may be one man, who being obliged by the devoted victim, and whose conscience on that account may so far revolt as to lead him to give his benefactor notice of his danger, that he may fly from it. That infernal plot, commemorated the 5th of November, was discovered and defeated by the friendship that one of the conspirators had for a person whom he wished to screen from the general massacre. And I know

know a Clergyman who had a very good living in America during the unhappy contest between Great Britain and her Colonies, who, upon refusing to pray for the Congress, instead of the King, was devoted to be *tarred and feathered*; but receiving notice of this intention, he fled immediately; and the next morning an enraged multitude broke into his house, dragged all the furniture out, and burned them in the street, and then turning his wife and children out, nailed up the doors to prevent their return. It was a glebe-house which prevented their setting it in flames.

Mr. O'Leary says that *when a Historian relates events, if he does not know the real causes, he should assign the most probable*. But I can't see the necessity of either, especially in the plain narrative designed by the Bishop of Cloyne. The event may be certain, though the Historian may not be able to assign either the real or probable cause of it.—Is the Gunpowder-Plot the less true, because the Historian cannot tell where and by whom it was first contrived, or what was the cause of such a bloody design? Is it the less certain that Charles the First was beheaded, because we are not told who forged and sharpened the axe, or who it was that gave the blow? Such minutiae I presume are not necessary to authenticate a story. Nor can Mr. O'Leary persuade the guardians of the Constitution that there have been no murders or other acts of violence committed on the Established Clergy, as the Bishop asserts, because he does not give us a list of the ruffians who perpetrated the facts, nor ascertain the hour and spot wherein the dark design was hatched. And yet by this sorry subterfuge does Mr. O'Leary hope to cast a shade of hypocripha over all the bloodshed and battery committed by those miscreants, whose cause he is pleading.

INSTEAD

INSTEAD of exaggerating, we find the Bishop advancing such palliatives for the misguided instruments of these outrages, as the atrocity of their conduct will admit. He attributes their proceedings to the *connivance of some Members of the Established Church, to the supineness of more, the timidity of the generality of Magistrates, and the encouragement of not a few.* This is as much as could be advanced in favour of deluded ignorance; and Mr. O'Leary is so sensible of it that he returns the Bishop thanks for this *aclimax*, as he calls it; at the same time he takes a very unfair advantage of this generosity, making it an evident confession, that *the gentlemen of the Established Church were under no apprehensions of its danger.*

Now though it must be allowed that timidity may lead some men to prefer their own safety to that of the publick, and that temporal interest will make others so short-sighted in respect to their spiritual concerns, as to consider these outrages as tending only to the abolition, without viewing the consequent effects, that of changing the claimants, of Tithes. Yet this can be no argument of the Church's safety, but rather shews the extremity of its danger. Many Gentlemen of the Established Church conducted themselves upon the same indolent short-sighted principles under the rebellious proceedings of Cromwell and his associates, and did not see their error till it was too late; and the Constitution was wounded beyond recovery, when they retreated only to deplore their misfortunes and curse their folly.

BUT to shew that the insurgents had no design against the Established Church more than they had against their own religion, Mr. O'Leary tells us that they made no distinction between the Clergy of either religion when once they became obnoxious to them:

them: *That the Catholick Priest suffered as well as the Protestant Minister, only he had not so much to lose; nor the same expectations of being reimbursed; and he blames the Bishop for not placing the Catholick sufferers on the back of the page: And he calls Theophilus a slanderer, for supposing that the charge of exaction on the Popish Clergy is artfully thrown in to support the character of impartiality, like the Mock Doctor in the Farce, who excuses his beating his wife, by telling her that when he beats her, he beats half himself. And tho' Theophilus justifies his suspicion, by shewing that the Popish Clergy have no law to support their demands, consequently that their parishioners were under no necessity to oppose their exactions by violence, when a bare refusal to pay would answer the purpose better. Yet the Bishop is blamed for offering as an excuse for Theophilus that an apprehension for the safety of religion will naturally excite a warmth. Will religion (says Mr. O'Leary) justify what nature and religion condemns? No; I say, nothing will justify an immoral act. But a zeal for religion will justify a suspicion of a body of men whose fraternity in times past were known to stick at no measures which might gain their religion the ascendancy of all others. Charity may lead men to hope that the Catholick Priesthood of our days, may not have so learned Christ; and may weaken the presumption that the same cruel bigotry still prevails. But then self-preservation will justify a cautious vigilance, when a restless spirit is observed to move amongst us, to discover whence that spirit arises, and whither it tends, in order to guard against its increase and fatal consequence. And if through the difficulty of penetrating the works of darkness, suspicion may fall on the innocent, as it sometimes does, this ought not to be attributed to malevolence, when, looking back, and tracing the conduct of Popish emissaries,*
there

there will be found sufficient reason to suspect the same practices in their successors.

BUT I can't help considering this reprobation of Theophilus's charge of a design to deceive the publick, by mentioning some trifling injuries and insults thrown upon two or three Popish Priests, as coming with an ill grace from Mr. O'Leary, who is himself so dogmatical as to affirm, that *the letters threatening the Established Clergy were contrived and posted up by the Tithe Proctors and Tithe Jobbers, whose interest it was to alarm the nation, and awaken the fears of Government.* And he even goes so far as to insinuate that those Tithe-Jobbers *set fire to their own corn, in hopes of a ten-fold gain for their wilful loss.* It is wonderful that he did not go still further, and affirm that they cropt their own ears, and buried themselves in pits lined with thorns too. *For interest and vengeance combined (he says) are capable of giving greater alarms.*

Now I should be glad to know why suspicion should be a crime in Theophilus, and a virtue in Mr. O'Leary? Or whether Mr. O'Leary has adopted that maxim of Hudibras

That no man does himself convince,
By his own doctrine of his sins;
That Saints whom oaths and vows oblige,
Know little of their privilege;
Further than that of carrying on,
Some self advantage of their own.
For if the Devil, to serve his turn
Can tell truth, why the Saints should scorn;
When it serves their's to tell a lye,
He thinks there's little reason why.

That Mr. O'Leary is no Saint in the above acceptance of the term, I fancy he himself will allow. That he is a Catholick Christian some are willing to allow. But that he is a Roman Catholick, nobody (who thinks he writes the dictates of his heart) can possibly allow.

Any

Any privilege therefore usurped over his brethren, must be considered as an infringement of the laws of primitive Christianity.

BUT after all, this rhetorical *aclimax*, for which Mr. O'Leary is so thankful to the Bishop of Cloyne, does no great service to the cause he is pleading: for if it admits a supineness or inadvertency in some, and a design to divert the attention of the people from a growing mischief in others. If it shews that the terrors of the last Popish reign, and the memory of our glorious Deliverer are now treated with too much indifference, it shews at the same time how the present insurgents, taking an advantage of this ungrateful and impolitick oblivion, gather strength, and in their outrages grow more daring and formidable.

HE acknowledges, however, that the Catholick Gentlemen acted with prudence in the steps they took to remove those suspicions to which their misrepresentors had laid them open, and compares them to the Fox in the fable, who took to his heels, when the Lion issued a proclamation ordering all the horned beasts to quit the forest; because though he had no horns, yet he did not know but the King might insist upon it that he had.

THIS fable of the Fox seems to be lugged in here with great impropriety, and shews that Mr. O'Leary is more arch than happy in his similes. It insults those whom he intended to compliment, and insinuates that the measures of Government are conducted by caprice. There was no proclamation or proscription against any body, much less an intention to accuse the innocent. To attribute therefore the address of the Roman Catholick Gentlemen to their apprehensions that Government might insist upon their *having horns*, that is their having an intention

to rebel, when they had none, is supposing them to have an infamous opinion of Government, and grounding their address upon fears natural to that opinion, and not upon their sincere and disinterested loyalty.

AFTER extolling the wise precaution of the Catholick Gentlemen, he becomes an advocate for the prudence and wisdom of the Catholick Bishops, which I should have passed by as a work of perfect supererogation, as nobody that I know of has advanced any thing derogatory to the birth, morals or abilities of those Titular Bishops. But his contrasting the zeal, activity and disinterestedness of those Prelates, with what he is pleased to call *the passive silence* of the Bishop of Cloyne for the space of fifteen months, would justify the sharpest retaliation, if comparisons were not odious. I shall therefore only observe that the Bishop of Cloyne's virtues in private life, abilities in publick, and attachment to the Constitution, will preserve his character, like a diamond overwhelmed in a dunghill, from the foul insinuations of Mr. O'Leary, whose praise and censure in this contrast bear an equal affinity to truth, and are evidently governed by his affections and averfions.

BUT the most consummate effrontery is that of offering his own example for the imitation of the Bishop of Cloyne, pointing out the time and the station which his Lordship should have taken; that is on the right hand of Mr. O'Leary, to harangue the White-Boys, and even composing an harangue for his Lordship. But as he is so expert and forward in dictating to his betters, I hope he will not take it amiss to find here an harangue formed for himself.

“ My

“ My Dear Fellow Catholicks and Countrymen,

“ As I am a Catholick Priest, bound to you by the solemn engagements of my office, and the strongest ties of fatherly affection, I cannot see your assembling here in this ludicrous and unlawful manner, without feeling for the unhappy delusion you are under, and dreading the probable event to yourselves and our holy religion. You will tell me your distresses have forced you to these measures. But if distresses were a plea for criminal acts the poor would always go unpunished, and that which was the temptation would become the sanction of the offender. But what makes you think yourselves so singularly distressed? Is it by comparing your condition with that of your rich landlords? Judging by this rule your distresses are great indeed. But where is the country exempt from such distresses? Where the dominion without poor as well as rich subjects? Kingdoms could not subsist without subordinate degrees of rank and riches among the people. But if this was aimed at, the different dispositions of men would prevent it: For if all the land and wealth of a kingdom was to be equally divided among the inhabitants, the indolence, debauchery and extravagance of some, and the industry, temperance and frugality of others, would in a very short time create the same inequality and distresses you now complain of.

“ But besides the unavoidable necessity of this difference in men's circumstances, there seems to be a providential design in it, to promote mutual love and benevolence upon earth, and by that means to forward the interests of man in the kingdom of Heaven. If the rich (who are God's stewards) make use of their abundance, in relieving the distresses of the poor, they are promised to be amply repaid by him, who is both able and faithful in the performance

mance of his promise ; and though this promise has not as universal an influence on the rich as could be wished, and might be expected, yet where it has, it should excite the poor, who are benefited by it, to be loving and grateful to their benefactors of what religion soever they may be. But as for those who are so unfortunate as to feel the oppressive hand of power and wealth, they ought not to repine, much less turn riotous under their oppressions : For God hath chosen the poor of this world to be heirs of his kingdom, not for being poor, but for bearing their poverty with patience and resignation, becoming the disciples of Christ, who was so very poor himself, that he had not even *where to lay his head*.

“ I HAVE now shewed you that you are not more distressed than the poor in other countries are. That all Governments require a disparity in men’s outward circumstances. That the different dispositions of men tend to promote this disparity ; and that God himself orders it to forward the everlasting happiness of his faithful servants : All which circumstances I hope will be duly considered by you, and induce you to decline these unlawful assemblies, to return to your respective homes, and to employ the time and money you are now wasting in these dangerous and expensive excursions, in labouring to get an honest livelihood for yourselves and families.

“ BUT there are two motives more which should lead you to follow my advice. The one is your own safety, and the other the credit and advantage of our holy religion. I will for the sake of argument allow your distresses to be greater than those of any other poor upon earth, though the contrary is manifest to those who have travelled in other countries, but for the sake of argument, let it be so. What then?

Do

Do you think that the measures you are pursuing are likely to bring you redress? Are the peasantry of a few parishes without arms, without ammunition, provisions or money, without discipline or visible head to conduct them; are you (I say) fit to cope with an army of regulars that will be employed to maintain the peace, and support the authority of Government? Or do you think that the burning, maiming, and killing which mark your nocturnal excursions, will escape detection and punishment, because committed in that secret and savage manner? You should know that every act of that nature encreases your enemies, and with these the spies over you, who will double their diligence to discover, seize and prosecute you. And do you think that Government will shew any lenity to a set of men *whose tender mercies are cruelty*, and who have directed that cruelty against the Established Clergy, through whose sides the Established Church must be mortally wounded? Do you think that the Protestants are less zealous in support of their religion, because they are less violent than the Catholics? And would the Protestants under a Catholick Government, be suffered to rob, maim and murder the Clergy for demanding what the law has set apart for their maintenance and support? Certainly they would not. Why then should you expect to carry on your depredations with impunity?

“ BUT the danger of these outrages is not confined to yourselves only, but you involve the whole Catholick Church of Ireland in your guilt, and subject her to the jealousies and resentment of Government. You must have heard how the intemperate zeal of our Church (upon the breaking out of what is called *the reformation*) led the Catholics to many acts of cruelty against the Hereticks (as they were

were called) and this cruel zeal was felt, not only in Catholick countries, but also in these dominions after the Protestant religion had been Established. This occasioned many penal laws to be enacted for the future prevention of such acts of barbarity. These penal laws are many of them, still in force against us; and though from the clemency of Government some of them have been lately repealed, and we find little inconvenience from those that are still in force, yet the remembrance of the many horrid attempts of our forefathers against the Established Constitution, must keep our Rulers on the watch, and inflame their jealousies so as to catch fire at every act of violence in which Catholicks are concerned. Those laws therefore, which though severe in the act, are mild in the execution, may, by these fresh provocations, rouse themselves, and breaking loose from the restraints that have been laid upon them by an indulgent Government, turn the clement toleration we experience into a rigorous restraint. Once more then, let me beseech you, for your own sakes, and for the sake of that Church of which you are members, to dissolve these bands of iniquity, which can have no other effect but that of bringing ruin on yourselves, discredit on your religion, and subjecting the whole body of Catholicks to the penalty of the laws."

A SPEECH of this nature formed in the energetick and facetious stile of Mr. O'Leary, would have had a better effect upon the infatuated minds of these insurgents than the humouring them in their opinion of superlative wretchedness; and ascribing that wretchedness to the exactions of the Established Clergy; which could have no other effect but that of directing the vengeance of the injured against their supposed oppressors. And this would have
done

done him more honour than forming an address for the Bishop of Cloyne; and would have sheltered him from the charge of agitating those outrages by his former equivocal addresses.

Mr. O'Leary says, *the Bishop of Cloyne, in relating the outrages in the South, gives only a profile of the picture, which forced the pencil into his hand, and compelled him to draw the picture with a full face.* We shall now see what an artist he is. The first instance of his picturesque abilities exhibits a scene in the diocese of Cloyne. (The parish is of no moment, therefore not to rob the representation of its zest, we must suppose the whole diocese to be but one parish) Here the common people deluded into a belief that going to Church for a few Sundays would make them Protestants in the eye of the law, and authorise them to carry arms in conjunction with the lower class of Protestants, to whom Proctors, &c. had become equally obnoxious: Under this delusion they flocked in several places to the Churches, and as they had not David's Psalms in metre, they chose the old ballad of Patrick's-day in the Morning for an anthem, and got a piper to play it as a voluntary on his favourite organ; as a preparation for Divine service in approaching the House of Worship. (Here we have several places mentioned in which there were several Churches, yet but one cavalcade, and one piper; no matter, the humour will make up for the improbability, and it is a pity to lose any of it) The marriage of Figaro represented on the French stage did not raise more humour, nor attract more spectators, than did this extraordinary marriage of the Paddereen and the Common Prayer-book in the diocese of Cloyne. Irish wives are remarkably attached to their husbands, and follow them wherever they go. Upon this occasion they give signal proofs of

the constancy of their attachment. Joan followed Darby, and Judy followed Paddy to Church, where the gay and unthinking were highly diverted with the novel spectacle of hands thrust into the Baptismal font in order to sprinkle about the holy water, and beads drawn out near the Communion table to reckon the Ave Marias.

THIS is the full face of the Picture that Mr. O'Leary has been obliged to draw to confront the Bishop of Cloyne's profile, and a very laughable caricature it is; equal I think to Butler's celebrated adventure of the *Bear and Fiddle*; and notwithstanding the farcistical levity, I might say loose profanity, that runs through it, he must be a gloomy enthusiast who can read it without a smile, or withhold from Mr. O'Leary the eclat it deserves. But on the other hand, he must be passionately fond of humour who can suffer himself to be diverted by it, from the apprehensions of danger resulting from such ridiculous assemblies.

HERE it is that Mr. O'Leary would have had the Bishop of Cloyne to stand at his right hand; and this is the mob whom his Lordship should have harangued in the speech he had composed for him.

ANOTHER instance of Mr. O'Leary's confronting the Bishop of Cloyne's profile, by a full face, is in the circumstance of nailing up the Church of Donaghmore, where his Lordship leaves his readers to look at the nails without pointing out the hand that fastened them. To supply this defect, Mr. O'Leary has recourse to his own invention, and affirms that the Protestant parishioners nailed up the Church out of love to a Clergyman whom the Bishop had removed, and hatred to another Clergyman who was appointed
to

to officiate in his room. Now this is an improbability too big to be swallowed even with the gilding of Mr. O'Leary's credit. It is well known that no Clergyman is removed from his cure, to make room for another, except for some irregularities; in which case the Protestant parishioner would be as glad to get rid of him, as the Bishop would find it his duty to remove him; consequently they would not have nailed up their own Church on that account, and Mr. O'Leary's full face must be deemed imperfect, till he ascertains the hand that raised the hammer, as he says the Bishop ought to have done. The presumption is that it was the act of a Popish mob, because it was never known that Protestants nailed up their own Church for any cause whatever, much less for the cause assigned by Mr. O'Leary.

ANOTHER of Mr. O'Leary's attempts to give us a full faced picture, is that of stoning the Clergyman in the performance of Divine Service. Here he tells us, there had been an unhappy affray owing to a warrant (deemed illegal) for levying Church rates. In this account however he acknowledges that he goes by information. The people resisted, and two lives were lost. The killers were indicted for murder. The bills were ignored. The people were exasperated, and a boy (here we have a guess expressed by a *perhaps*) a son of one of the men who had been killed, began to throw stones, but was immediately hindered.

HE must be blind who cannot see the daubing colouring of this face. Mr. O'Leary not only professes to go by hearsay, but in a few lines below he acknowledges himself a stranger to the circumstances, and unacquainted with the minute detail of them. But to soften them as well as he can, he supposes that the stones were thrown by a boy; and to give

a colour of justice to the act, the boy is said to be the son of one of the persons killed. Supposing this to be the case, why was the Clergyman stoned who had no hand in the murder? In short, it was not the murderer of his father that the boy stoned (if indeed it was a boy that did it) but it was the Minister of that Church to which he had been bred up in enmity, and in the persecution of which his father had lost his life.

Mr. O'Leary acknowledges, that the Bishop of Cloyne and he relate the same facts, but that they differ in their inferences: That is, the Bishop will have it that these facts are founded on Popery; but Mr. O'Leary supposes them to be the result of exasperation against a new Clergyman, whom the Protestant parishioners did not like; and for that reason set this Popish boy, whose father had been killed, upon stoning him. It was *an ebullition of passion*, says Mr. O'Leary, occasioned by resentment, and not a Popish Confederacy against the Established Religion: To confirm which he gives us a foreign anecdote, of which his head is so full that they tumble from him without propriety. *Pope Alexander the Sixth* (he says) *ordered six Cardinals to be sewed up in a bag and cast into the Tyber.* Yet none but a fool would imagine that it was with a view to overthrow their religion; so no wise man will construe into a plot against the Church, two or three stones thrown at a Clergyman by a boy after seeing the mangled body of his father stretched dead in the field in consequence of ecclesiastical dues. Now if any wise man can see a just analogy between this act of Pope Alexander, and that of the boy who stoned the Clergyman, without any provocation given by the Clergyman for such treatment, then I shall allow Mr. O'Leary to be more just in his families than the generality of his readers

readers think him to be. But if Pope Alexander treated six Cardinals as Mr. O'Leary describes, they were either six villains that deserved it, or the Pope was a villain for the treatment. But though he could not be supposed by this act to destroy that Church from whence he derived such arbitrary power; yet this is no reason why the nailing up of Churches, opposing the collection of parish rates, and stoning of a Clergyman in the execution of his office, may not have an ultimate tendency to overthrow the Establishment: For though we should be disposed to believe Mr. O'Leary that all these were the acts of Protestants in which the Roman Catholics had no hand; and that some Roman Catholics may hold such acts in as much detestation as the Protestants, yet it is feared there are many more of that persuasion very well disposed to engage in every thing that may have a tendency to overthrow a Church, which they are taught to consider as triumphing on the ruins of their own, and which they know has at all times been agreeable to their Spiritual Head, whose power of absolution they are persuaded of, and which absolution has been liberally bestowed upon such zealous adventurers in so righteous a cause.

BUT to justify this opposition to the payment of Church dues, in which those allotted for purchasing the Elements for the holy Communion are particularly mentioned, he observes by way of a sneer that this was not a Popish confederacy to overturn the Established Church by extinguishing fervor and devotion; for he did not perceive any extraordinary zeal for the Sacrament either in Catholics or Protestants: And then he launches into the commonplace taunts on the conduct of the Ministers of religion, who for the sake of lucre and emolument would preach up Christ in Europe, and Diana at Ephesus.

Now

Now if there be any truth in this reflection, the Established Clergy are no more concerned in it than those of any other Christian profession (for according to the Infidel adage *Priests of all religions are the same*) though by evident implication they seem to be the butt that is shot at. Supposing therefore that the Established Clergy are more attached to this world than those of any other profession, how does this justify the barbarities they have experienced? If it does not, to what purpose is all this declamation? Railing is not confuting; nor is it an extenuation of their sufferings that the Catholick Priests partake of the same. It was no part of the Bishop's plan to relate the sufferings of any but his own Clergy, nor did it come under his cognizance; therefore it is left to Mr. O'Leary, who had the means of information, and the art of colouring the designs of his favourites. Plain matters of fact was the Bishop's province, conjectural minutiae the province of Mr. O'Leary.

THIS unfair inuendo against the Established Clergy has been improved, with a vengeance, by a person who has stepped forward in this controversy, and who from his scurrility has rendered himself unworthy of a serious reply; because a man who charges himself with *duplicity and treachery* in the first page of his pamphlet deserves no credit to the end of it; and was it not for an insult which he has thrown upon the Clergy in general from the circumstance of three unhappy victims to their own indiscretion, I should have left him to the contempt he has so deservedly brought upon himself.

THE crimes of *murder, adultery, and forgery*, charged by this calumniator on the Clergy indiscriminately, are grounded upon three examples only, and these crowding

crowding upon each other for the space of eighteen months made the depravity the more remarkable, and I will say the more surprising, as such instances could not be produced in the memory of the oldest man, nor has history furnished us with any thing like it from the earliest introduction of Christianity in these kingdoms.

THE Clergy are born with the passions and infirmities of other men, therefore if under the same natural imperfections, they avoid, in the majority, many of those crimes which prevail amongst the Laity, this is certainly as much as ought to be expected from men laying no claim to infallibility. The perfection of angels must not be required from imperfect humanity. But without intending to apologize for the three culprits alluded to, I think it necessary to remark that these enormities happened in England, where there are above ten thousand Clergy of the Established Church. If therefore, in so great a number, three are upon record as perpetrators of those enormities, would not a little candour place this to the unhappy consequence of that frailty which too often proves too masterly for the purest intellects, or most refined accomplishments? Would not justice admit that three out of ten thousand offending (even every year) in that atrocious manner, were fewer by many hundreds than are to be found in any other society of men in the community, and give them a share of credit proportioned to that purity, which, though not perfect, is superior to their fellow-creatures, by so many degrees? But to bring forward those few criminals as instances to prove the superior purity of the Popish and Presbyterian Clergy to those of the Established Church, is slandering upon such false grounds as a fair enemy would be ashamed of. If comparisons are to be drawn

drawn and we would form a true estimate of the morals of the Popish Clergy, we should have recourse to Italy, France, Spain or Portugal, where they are to be found in numbers proportioned to those of the English establishment. So should we go to those countries where the Calvinistick principles are established, to be acquainted with the general purity of their spiritual teachers, and then *pari numero* give the preference of sanctity where truth and equity require.

THE different state of health between two towns is not to be determined by the mortality of each. One town may bury a thousand of its inhabitants annually, and yet be healthier than another that buries but an hundred, provided there is a disproportion of inhabitants of twenty to one between them. And as it is in the course of the natural, so it will be found in that of the moral world. Where the greater number of people are, there, generally speaking, will be the greater prevalence of vice.

THERE is but one exception that I know of to this rule, and that must be drawn from the religion of the people. Less iniquity, it is to be hoped, will be found under the prevalence of Christianity than under Mahometanism and Idolatry, but between one Christian sect and another the habits of virtue and vice will be equal where the numbers are equal. Therefore unless it can be proved that Popery and Presbyterianism confer more grace upon their Professors than the Established Church does upon her's, or that the preachers of the first two are of a more angelick texture than those of the last, the inference that this *self-tormentor* would draw from three or four ecclesiastical culprits, bestows no superior merit to Dissenters, whilst it betrays a malevolent intention to calumniate

calumniate those virtues to which he is an absolute stranger himself: For which feeble effort, I have no other wish but that the poverty which, this *miserable martyr to his own malversation, this victim of vanity*, pleads so feelingly throughout his pamphlet, may not sink him totally under the weight of his indiscretion, but procure him some charitable donations from those on whom he has bestowed so large a measure of superior virtues. *

BUT to return to Mr. O'Leary.

THIS professed vindicator of the Munster insurgents and indirect reviler of the Established Clergy, has so larded his whole pamphlet with acrimonious sneers on these last, and with warm encomiums on those of the Church of Rome, that truth must suffer under so partial a bias. It is his own observation, that *people avail themselves of the obloquies and reproaches against the Clergy*; and he has taken care to encourage this propensity, as far as report and insinuation will do it. The most improbable tales, hatched and brought forth by the fertile genius

* Swift (in his Sentiments of a Church of England man) says, I do not see how that mighty passion for the Church which some men pretend can well consist with those indignities and that contempt they throw upon the persons of the Clergy. But he attributes it to the universal depravity of manners, and the perpetual bandying of factions amongst us. When without weighing the motives of justice, law, conscience, or honour, every man adjusts his principles to those of the party he hath chosen. Thus the landed youth, with a small share of literary accomplishments, getting into Parliament, readily joins in the cry against the Clergy, and forms the higher opinion of himself from the greater contempt he entertains, not only for his Vicar at home, but for the whole Clerical order. Thus the greatest dunce in the parish becomes the most wicked and intractable of the flock, and it is the honour of the Clergy that such only are their enemies.

of

of a *Popish Devoto*, and fostered by the connivance of a *Cabin Knight of the Post*, (like miracles feigned and sworn to for the advantage of the Church) have been picked up with avidity, and related with assurance by this pretended *Elucidator of Facts*. Of this I shall give the reader a palpable instance in the identical farcasm of this humourist.

“ In the province where Dr. Woodward and I reside, and now the theatre of pamphlets and politics, there lived a poor peasant; his poverty had not deprived him of those qualities which constitute a husband and a father; to him a child was born, who did not live long enough to enjoy his father's estate; he died, and for want of a shilling to purchase the hallowed ground wherein to deposit the defunct heir of an opulent fortune, the father rolled him up in a bundle of straw, and smuggled him into the church-yard in the dead of the night. Happy! thrice happy! had he met on that fatal night a Custom-house Officer—he would have escaped with the contraband goods. But alas! his destiny was to meet with one of those officers who have recourse to what the Moderator calls *the Court Christian*. A decree (whether real or fictitious I cannot tell) from the Bishop's Court was produced by the *Carrion-bunter* and another, who were hurrying away the peasant, fainting after a violent resistance. Luckily he was met by an intimate friend of mine, who released him by paying the charnel-house fees.”

THIS story has more of malevolence than truth in it. Indeed it carries a slander upon the face of it. In the first place, he has neither given us the persons by whom, the time when, or the stage where, this *tragi-comedy* was acted; but has taken a whole province to fix the scene in, to escape detection. In the next place

place there is not one Church in twenty throughout the kingdom (those of towns excepted) where any dues are demanded for funerals; these and all other parochial charges (though justly due) are generally consolidated with the Tithes. And lastly, though there may be some exceptions to this general rule, no Ecclesiastical Court would take cognizance of such a cause, supposing that any Clergyman or *carrion-hunter* could be disposed to prosecute a poor peasant for wrapping his child in a bundle of straw, digging a grave himself, and interring him in the church-yard. Neither could the peasant be arrested and hurried away (we must suppose to prison) by virtue of any precept from a Spiritual Court. If any villain therefore forged a decree in order to extract a shilling from a wretched father for the interment of his child (which must have been the case if there is any truth in this story) he must be a bad man who has laid it on the Clergyman, nor is he much better who insinuates the same and retails it as a certainty.

BUT the story is well and roundly asserted, and will be readily credited by those who are always disposed to believe the worst of the Established Clergy.

SIMILAR to the above is the charge of *peculation and exaction*, too generally thrown out against the Established Clergy, and attempts made to support it by the grossest falsities. I shall extract one only from Counsellor Trant's pamphlet. It is that of the Rev. Mr. Hare, Vicar General of the diocese of Cashel, of whom it had been reported that he had forced from one of his parishioners no less than thirty-two shillings per acre for the Tithes of potatoes. The circumstance was this: Mr. Hare had his parish of Ballysheehane viewed in 1780, when it appeared that the farm of Garrane, occupied by a Mrs. Strang,

Strang, would produce corn, potatoes, &c. to such an amount as would entitle Mr. Hare to £33 1s. 4d. for Tithes. Mr. Hare after this return of the view went in person to Mrs. Strang to offer the Tithes at any valuation she should be willing to put upon it. But Mrs. Strang not being at home, her Agent told Mr. Hare that no composition should be made with him, nor should he get any thing for his Tithes unless he immediately made Mrs. Strang a lease of them. This Mr. Hare refused to do, and the whole Tithes of the Farm were that year subtracted. Mr. Hare waited till the Spring of the next year to give Mrs. Strang time to offer and make a compensation; but finding no offer made, nor any likelihood of obtaining his right, he libelled for the value in the Spiritual Court, and obtained judgment for £33 1s. 4d. But Mr. Hare instead of the sum decreed, which he might have insisted upon, accepted of £10 though the malevolence of some people led them to misrepresent this transaction, by adding the costs of suit to the Tithes of the potatoes, thus making it thirty-two shillings per acre; yet Mrs. Strang had more gratitude and more honour than to suffer such a slanderous imputation to lie on Mr. Hare's character; accordingly she gave the following attestation in his favour:

“ MANY false and injurious reports having been most industriously propagated, relative to the demands made on me by the Rev. Mr. Hare, in the year 1780 for Tithe; to remove the effects of such malevolent misrepresentations, I think it but justice to declare, that the Rev. Mr. Hare offered to let me have my Tithes for any thing I pleased to give him for them; but by the improper conduct of my Agent, (who declared without any directions from me) that unless Mr. Hare gave a lease he should get nothing.

nothing. Mr. Hare sued me for the full value, and after he had obtained a decree against me, he relinquished all advantage from it, and let me have for £10 Tithes which he had proved in Court to be worth £33.

“ Mr. Hare receives only half the Tithes in the Eastern division of the parish of Ballysheehane, and my Tenants acknowledge themselves well pleased with his charges.

“ I make and subscribe this declaration in vindication of Mr. Hare's character.

October 1786.

“ MARY STRANG.”

THIS is the least Mrs. Strang could have done, not only on account of the generosity of Mr. Hare, but on account of her own misconduct in this business; for though her Agent might have acted thus imprudently without her knowledge, yet she could not but know that the Tithes were subtracted, and she had time enough to compound the matter and prevent its litigation, had she not been persuaded and very well inclined to deprive Mr. Hare of his legal dues, which would have justified him in exacting every shilling which the law had given him. I should be glad to see the Layman, who, upon a contest of Tithes, being adjudged to pay his Incumbent £10 would generously pay down £33. When such a man is produced, I shall not think so highly of this conduct of Mr. Hare, whose character receives a double lustre from his overlooking the fraudulent design to deprive him of his right, and shews by his example how little truth there is in the charge of *peculation and exaction* thrown upon the Established Clergy, and how artful their enemies are in diverting the eyes of the peasantry from the real authors of
their

their poverty, and in directing them to mark their sense of misery in lines of blood and devastation on the stigmatized Clergy.

Mr. O'Leary has contributed very largely to establish this opinion in the White-Boys, not only by declaring that *their distresses originate in the dues of the Clergy, which are grounded on flagitious and unjust laws*; but also by declaring that *Captain Right's Table of Tithes was moderate, more just, and more suitable to the distresses of the poor*. Any demand therefore above one shilling and six-pence per acre for wheat and barley, as fixed by these impartial Legislators, must be esteemed as exaction, though not the sixth part of the real value; and he who shall presume to demand more, must do it at the expense of his reputation, or at the risque of his life.

AFTER impeaching the characters of the Established Clergy, Mr. O'Leary becomes solicitous for that of his own fraternity. He had before exhibited his Titular Prelates as *mirrors of wisdom and knowledge*; as *examples of piety and virtue*; as *paragons of birth, titles and fortunes*; all which super-eminent, native and acquired endowments *qualify them* (as he says) *for determining the fate of nations, and for directing the Councils of Kings*. These peerless Prelates assembled, deliberated, and with a disinterestedness worthy of Apostles, declared that a small stipend was requisite to support their Clergy, and with the wisdom of Senators enjoined that this stipend, which followed from benevolence, should not be exacted with rigour.

BUT these Prelates went further; for *they removed four or five Priests* from their parishes, and substituted others in their room, *preferring the peace of society to all*

all canonical quibbles. What a profundity of wisdom appears in this act? And what an unparalleled condescension in men, armed by the Vatican with authority to open or shut the gates of Heaven to whom, or against whom they please? To Mr. O'Leary this appears the depth of humility; for (as he observes) *a more painful sacrifice could not have been made*: That is, a sacrifice of such awful powers to the caprice of an ignorant and ungovernable rabble, not to be softened by the promise of Heaven, nor deterred by the threats of Hell. But to me it appears in a different light; it looks as if there were two sorts of humility in the Popish Church; one which is practised under a controuling power, and another which prevails under the power of controuling.

BUT how did the inferior Clergy behave? So perfectly humble and resigned, that like the prophet they were unanimous in crying out, *If it be on my account that this storm is raised cast me overboard.* No more could be said—no more could be done—And yet more they did do: For having no legal claims upon their flock, to shew that they did not take orders for any worldly emolument, they required nothing from them but what they themselves were willing to give. It were to be wished that Mr. O'Leary (who has put this declaration in the mouths of his brethren) had given us a definition of the word *emolument*. For my part, I always thought *emolument* and *pecuniary rewards* were the same thing; and upon that acceptance of the word, I hope to make it appear that by the accustomed fees paid to the Popish Clergy for the different offices of their function, they receive more than the Established Clergy do by Tithes. The Bishop of Cloyne has investigated this truth on a plan suitable to the greatness of the subject, stating facts on a scale worthy of publick attention. By
dividing

dividing the aggregate income of all the parishes, including Deaneries and other dignities among the number of Clergymen in Ireland, it would give a general average of £148 2s. 8½d. per head to the whole body of the Clergy, who being estimated at one thousand makes the whole amount of Tithes £148118 1s. 8d.

A Pamphlet under the signature of *The Farmer*, gives us as accurate an account as the nature of the thing will admit, of the money actually paid by the members of the Popish Church, to their Priests throughout the kingdom. He reckons the Roman Catholicks to be two millions, out of whom one million and five hundred thousand go to confession twice every year, when every one pays an English shilling at each confession, this amounts to

		162500 00 0
Suppose a million of shillings laid down on the Altar at Christmas this amounts to	}	54166 13 4
He rates christenings, marriages and funerals at 5d. each that comes to	}	20833 6 8
		<hr/>
The whole of those emoluments amounts to	£	237500 00 0
The amount of all the Tithes in Ireland is	}	148118 1 8
Which is less than the emoluments of the Popish Clergy according to the above calculation	}	88381 18 4

HENCE the reason of their not refusing *their spiritual assistance*; hence all their *zeal and disinterestedness, and charity for the souls of their parishioners*. Hence it is that they made *an anticipated sacrifice of all the prospects of this life at the foot of the Altar*; and hence their *disregard of any worldly emolument*.

BUT

BUT there is another source, which the Farmer has not taken notice of in his pamphlet, from whence streams of gold, like the Lydian Pactolus, flow into the Popish Church, and swell the emoluments of her Clergy even to a spring-tide of profit, and that is *Purgatory*, with its numerous peculatory channels, such as *commutation of penances, indulgences, extreme unctions, masses for the dead, and months minds*; all which demonstrate the skill of the Popish Clergy in religious chemistry, an art utterly unknown to the parochial Clergy, who seek nothing but such dues as the law has given them; and even those are curtailed at least one half of their value, by a fraudulent combination of men of all ranks, conditions and religions in the state; nor can they receive the other half without the murmurs and defamatory clamours not of sectaries only, but even of those who profess themselves the members and friends of the Established Church.

BUT now I have mentioned some of the speculative doctrines of Popery, which I had no intention to do, being quite foreign to the main design of these strictures; I think it necessary to give the reader part of a speech which Mr. O'Leary, *with his usual pedantry*, has thought proper to put into the mouths of Dissenters in reply to *a supposed* invitation from the Bishop of Cloyne, to unite with the Established Church, in checking the dangerous encroachment of Popery.

“ IT is extraordinary in your Lordship to alarm the publick with the dangers of Popery, when you retain the most oppressive part of a religion, from which you are sprung; *Tithes* that are oppressive to the poor; and *pre-eminence* which in all ages has not been well relished by the rich. We cannot in reason hate a Catholick for his speculative creed. His be-
F
lief

lief of the real presence affects us no more than if he had believed that Berenice's tresses were changed into a comet. Nor are we much concerned whether in that immensity beyond the grave, there may be an intermediate place between the two extremes of complete happiness and complete misery. A place where the soul atones for venial lapses, and pays off a part of the debt it has contracted here. It is equal to us where a man pays his debts, whether here or in Purgatory, provided he pays ourselves what he owes us. And *however clamorous a mitred Divine may be about a Popish Purgatory; he may perhaps go further and speed worse.*" That is *he may go to Hell*, for he cannot go to Heaven, *and speed worse.*

BUT after all this arch and charitable disposal of the Bishop of Cloyne, for not believing a Purgatory (which was no part of his Lordship's subject) and the benign beatification of his own prelates and brethren for believing that, and other Papal absurdities, in which Mr. O'Leary displays the true spirit of Popery. After all this, I say, the Bishop of Cloyne, in no part of his pamphlet, invites the Dissenters to join him in his attack upon the Catholics. He draws a comparison indeed between the indulgent principles of the Established Church, and the intolerant principles of Popery; and then leaves them to judge whether under a Popish establishment, which must follow the destruction of the present, they will fare as well as they now do.

BUT the whole of this address, which Mr. O'Leary has composed for the Dissenters, is so curious, so crafty, and so cringing that I can't help giving the reader a little more of it.

“ WHEN

“ WHEN you call us then to your assistance against our Catholick neighbours, we shall not obey the summons until you divide with us the spoils of piety, which have been transmitted to you by the Catholick Clergy, whom you are now attacking.”

WHEN *you call upon us*; looks as if the call was not yet made, consequently no reason given for this elaborate address. And when he talks of *the spoils of piety* being transmitted by the Catholick Clergy, he talks nonsense. The emoluments of the Established Clergy, *or the spoils of piety* as he chooses to call them, have only changed proprietors by the change of Government, much against the inclination of Mr. O’Leary and his brethren. But he goes on.

“ WHEN they (the Roman Catholics) were groaning under the yoke of penal laws; We (Presbyterians) published at Dungannon those resolutions which Europe read with admiration; in them we declared, that as we held freedom of conscience sacred in ourselves, so we held it sacred in others; and gloried in the prospect of our Catholick fellow-subjects emancipation. America copied after the illustrious example. Any person who would preach or practice a contrary doctrine, is an agitator indeed; and an agitating Bishop is as obnoxious to us as an agitating Friar.”

As for the Resolutions of Dungannon being *read and admired by all Europe*, that is *gratis dictum*, being more than Mr. O’Leary can make appear. It is rather more probable that nine-tenths of Europe never heard of them. And it is very certain that one half of Europe had they seen them would have condemned them as repugnant to their own religious principles and practices. But this false compliment to the

Delegates (who were a mixed body of Episcopal and Presbyterians, and of whom the first were the majority; and even the Resolutions were originally penned by an Episcopal Delegate) annihilates the character of disinterested integrity, and consequently destroys the value of it, as bordering too close upon *a cringing sycophancy*, and violating that candour and integrity which are the characteristicks of a fair and generous literary antagonist. Mr. O'Leary here insinuates that before the Dungannon resolves, all who differed from the Established Church were restrained in their publick worship, and that the Bishop of Cloyne meant to renew that restraint, than which nothing can be more diametrically opposite to truth, the Bishop declaring himself *a friend to a liberal and Christian spirit of toleration*; nor has his Lordship dropt a syllable in his pamphlet, that can be construed directly or indirectly into such a design. If this then is not the chicane of an *agitating Friar*, we must wait Mr. O'Leary's better information.

Now for his own panegyrick.

“ You have directed your arrows against Mr. O'Leary in particular. He has washed off the paint which your brush has laid on his face. He has proved in his narrative, that you have not given an accurate account of the disturbances in Munster. You have not stemmed the torrent—You have not assigned the genuine causes of the insurrections; which in your heart you know not to have originated in a Popish confederacy against either Church or State; but in the despair of wretchedness, ascribed indeed to several causes, amongst which Tithes and Tithe Canters are to be enumerated.—Mr. O'Leary has fully justified the Catholick Body from the foul aspersions of Theophilus and the insinuation of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne.

Cloyne. He has called on you both to produce one *agitating Friar*, or Romish Missionary sent here to sow sedition in the land. There is the challenge given by conscious innocence. We shall not then quarrel with our Catholick neighbours, much less with Mr. O'Leary. If he has any more to say we shall hear him. It is the privilege to which every injured man is entitled; but we consider him as fully acquitted, whatever further remarks he may think fit to make on your pamphlet."

WELL, go thy ways thou irrefragable Doctor O'Leary! Thou master of argumentative Legerdemain, and refuter of *Non-Entities*! Bear away the prize of self-eulogism from all the self-important apologists for the Southern Insurgents. Not Amias Griffith himself, whose familiar modesty and humble assurance may be read in bright characters on the windows of every inn from Cork to Belfast, graced by some accomplished female, whom he honours with the appellation of *his Dear*; not this same *Esquire*, with all his egotisms, is worthy to hold a candle to thy pen whilst employed in your lucubrations!

BUT pray Mr. O'Leary, where does the Bishop of Cloyne charge you with being an *agitating Friar*? Does he not, on the contrary, profess that he cannot charge you with being so, much less with being sent here to sow sedition. It is true the Bishop says, that in his opinion your publications have a tendency to that effect; and by quoting you fairly delivers you over to the reader, and lets you speak for yourself; nor can all the powers of sophistry and prevarication which you are so perfectly master of, and so ardently exert in commenting on your addresses, persuade the impartial to judge otherwise of them, but as instigators to sedition.

BUT

BUT in the name of wonder, how could a man of Mr. O'Leary's acumen suppose that forming and putting a speech in the mouths of Dissenters would support that conscious innocence which he so confidently boasts of? Is not this constituting himself a Judge, and making the Dissenters the Jury; which is like setting a malefactor on the Bench, and permitting him to call on his accomplices for a verdict? The measure of justice which may be expected from such an appointment may be ascertained without any great share of precision.

THEOPHILUS indeed is a little more blunt than the Bishop, and positively charges Mr. O'Leary with exciting those commotions, and his reasons for so doing he extracts from his own writings.—Let him speak for himself.

“ I HAVE observed and read several addresses to these insurgents, many of them under the affected disguise of recommending moderation, holding out to them the greatest encouragement to proceed in their outrages. None of these addresses attracted my notice so much as some signed O'Leary. Whether the writer signs his real name, or makes use of the fictitious signature of O'Leary I know not; but surely these addresses, notwithstanding the dulness and ignorance of the author, deserve some animadversion, from the turbulent, factious and insolent spirit they breathe, though couched in all the terms of humility, which low breeding and a species of little cunning, the common talent of the vulgar, the dull and the illiterate, can plentifully furnish. In these addresses the author pathetically laments the manifold oppressions and grievances under which the insurgents labour, but cautiously avoids specifying what those grievances and oppressions are; and after inflaming the

the minds of the vulgar with all the common-place stuff of *oppression, exaction, tyranny, persecution, &c.* and after endeavouring to persuade them that they are the most wretched and miserable beings on the face of the earth (*still dealing in generals*) he advises them to bear their oppressions with patience. That is he first goads the populace to madness, and then exhorts them to patience, when he has rendered them incapable of listening to any exhortation: He tells them they have just cause for committing all the outrages they have committed, and by way of screening himself from punishment for his factious publications, he throws in a feeble exhortation to them to submit to the laws as they at present stand, till the meeting of the Parliament; and then insolently undertakes to assure them, that Parliament will overturn the ancient laws, constitution, and religion of the State, and legalize all the resolutions of this rebellious Popish mob, by enacting them into laws. And as he plainly enough insinuates that Parliament will be induced so to do through mere terror of the power and fury of the insurgents, he by such insinuations holds out to them the strongest encouragement to extend their confederacy, and continue their outrages; and with true Jesuitical duplicity, talks of peace and obedience to the laws, whilst he is really blowing the trumpet of rebellion."

"THE only grievances or oppressions complained of by the insurgents, are exactions in the collection of Tithes by the Established Clergy, and exactions by their own Secular Clergy or Parish Priests, for performing the several rites of their religion. These last exactions this Friar could not promise that they would be relieved from by an act of the Legislature; for they were not by any law of the land obliged to pay their Priests any thing; it depended merely on
their

their own choice what to pay, or whether to pay any thing or not. So that when the Friar promises the insurgents redress of their grievances by authority of Parliament, he promises that the Protestant Parliament of this Protestant State will by law support the frauds and violence of a Popish mob; and through terror of their power further reduce or annihilate the pittance which the Clergy of the Established Church are compelled to accept of from them, in lieu of that support and maintenance, to which by common and statute law, they are at present entitled: And to fill up the measure of the insolence of this scribbler, he professes himself to be a Popish Friar, who thus undertakes the destruction of the Established Church by authority of Parliament."

SUCH is the paint (to use Mr. O'Leary's own phrase) which the Bishop of Cloyne and Theophilus have laid on; and which he makes the Presbyterians say he has washed off his face. We shall now see how he has verified this declaration.

HE is charged with inculcating an opinion of wretchedness in the White-Boys beyond that of any other peasantry upon earth, and with attributing their wretchedness to the Tithes exacted from them by the Established Clergy. In his vindication he says that all parties acknowledge that the peasantry were wretched. The Clergy know it and blame the Landlord; the Landlords know it and they blame the Clergy's Agent. It was not his duty to dictate to either. But if the Lord Bishop of Cloyne affirms that they did not suffer by Tithes he should be better informed. Now if this is not charging the supposed superlative misery upon the dues and exactions of the Clergy, it will be difficult to find a person acquainted with the English tongue.

The

The White-Boys themselves knew enough of it to consider it in that light, and have pointed their vengeance accordingly. But he further says it was not his business to enlarge upon these miseries in consequence of low wages and rack rents, the reduction of Tithes and the dues of Parish Priests being the only objects mentioned in the insurgents proclamations. Now either he thought that low wages and rack rents contributed to this wretchedness, or he did not think so. If he thought so, candour and justice should have led him to set the deluded people to rights, by taking part of the odium from the Clergy and placing it on the proper objects. But if he did not think so, then the paint which he would insinuate he had washed off, still sticks upon his face.

He is charged not only with telling the insurgents that he knows them to be more oppressed than any sort of men in the world; but that they had a right to expect redress from the Legislature, and yet that the Legislature shew no compassion for them; that therefore they must remain in their misery, having no remedy but that of patience, *which softens the afflictions of sufferers*. Thus (as Theophilus observes) goading the populace to madness, and then exhorting them to patience, when he had rendered them incapable of listening to any exhortation.

In answer to this he says in his vindication, that he is not ashamed for having addressed a discontented and oppressed people in the stile of sympathy and tenderness. That he recommended patience which softens the afflictions of sufferers. That he shall ever pity the poor and recommend them to their rulers; and then he contrasts the conduct of the unfeeling Priest with that of the charitable Samaritan;

maritan; and charges the Bishop of Cloyne with exhibiting symptoms of joy in the expectation that these poor fellows will not be relieved by their Rulers. Relieved of what? Relieved of paying Tithes (for low wages and rack rents were not complained of) still holding out the Clergy as the sole authors of this misery, and even stigmatizing a Prelate as glorying in it. If this is not goading the populace to madness, and driving them to despair by making them wretched beyond redemption, we must wait for Mr. O'Leary's Vocabulary to settle the standard of the English idiom.

BUT he goes further still in his vindication, for he says he still indulges the hope that the Legislators of Ireland will redress the grievances of the wretched, at a period which their wisdom will appoint. That is (as Theophilus observes) since this confederated banditti of Papists openly declared that they would not pay Tithes to the Established Clergy but in such proportion as they pleased; he is in hopes that the authority of Parliament will support those resolutions, and reduce, if not totally abolish the maintenance and support of the Clergy.

HE has been charged with impeaching the laws of the country with *severity*; the Crown Lawyers with *chicanery*; the witnesses with *perjury*, and the Juries with *prejudice*. All which he frankly acknowledges; and he asks what was the purpose of this enumeration but to make a deeper impression on the minds of the deluded people by a greater variety of images. What might have been his design is best known to himself; but men who are obliged to call in probability to build their opinions upon, may think that this enumeration was intended to recommend obscurity, circumspection and caution in their proceedings,
as

as the surest means to baffle such enemies. But he further asks, suppose he had said in plain terms to the insurgents, Do not put yourselves in the power of either Judge or Jury; King or Parliament; Lawyer or witnesses; what would it amount to, more than if he had said, behave as peaceable subjects, and do not put yourselves in the power of any person. Indeed if he had not previously annexed an infamous stigma to the *Law*, the *Lawyer*, the *Witness*, and the *Jury*, it might have passed as he would have it; but with those epithets annexed the advice amounts to this: You have *injustice*, *craft*, *perjuries*, and *prejudices* engaged against you; let it be your study to match them all in their own way.

THIS charge also, by his own confession, he has not been able to wash away.

HE says that these insurrections originated in despair and wretchedness, ascribable indeed to several causes: As he blames the Bishop of Cloyne for not assigning the genuine causes of the insurrections, and promises to give a more accurate account of them himself. Why did he not mention some of those causes, and not confine them (as he has done) to *Tithes and Tithe-Cantors*? Will he call that accuracy, which every impartial man must at first sight perceive to be acrimony? He says that he had one object in view, which was *to work upon the passions by the fittest springs*. This has so much the appearance of truth, that every body will give him credit for it. His object was to inflame the insurgents, and the dues and *pretended* exactions of the Clergy were the fittest springs to set them in motion.

WHAT then is become of his challenge to the Bishop and Theophilus to produce one agitating
Friar

Friar who has sown sedition in the land? The Bishop and Theophilus have produced sufficient evidence from his own publications. I have done the same from his vindication, to prove him to be the man, whilst he has nothing to offer in his behalf but a few palliative phrases, calculated to disguise the lurking poison, and to screen him from the insulted laws.

AND yet with all these self-evident truths fastened upon him, he has the confidence to make the Dissenters say they consider him as fully acquitted. A mode of courting friendship that is humble and cringing, even to mean-spiritedness, and betrays a guilt too glaring for any other concealment. Upon this occasion I think it necessary to observe, that though the Presbyterians and Roman Catholics are equally Christians, yet in their religious creed they are as opposite to each other as it is possible for two of the same profession to be; and notwithstanding this, they can unite in bearing hard on the Established Church. One contributes his share of common-place declamation; another his share of libertine wit. One blames her for retaining too much of the Popish superstition; the other for approaching too near the Presbyterian fanaticism; whilst both contribute their malicious envies at the provision appointed for her Ministers, which perhaps is the only ground for their dislike to her as a branch of the Catholick Church.

HE makes the Dissenters also say that he has fully justified the Catholick Body from the foul aspersions of Theophilus and the insinuations of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne. Alas! his anxiety for the Catholick Body has made him a perfect Maniack.

For this he sits with terror quaking,
And combats Devils of his own making.

By

By the Catholick Body he must mean all the Roman Catholicks in the kingdom, for the expression will bear no other interpretation. Where then, let me ask, did the Bishop or Theophilus charge the Catholick Body (or Body of Roman Catholicks) with any hostile design against the Established Church? Both of them indeed consider the insurgents as a Popish Body, who had commenced hostilities, and formed a solemn league and covenant against the Established Clergy, and the consequent proscription of the Protestant Faith; but they have confined this charge entirely to the province of Munster; and only said that these outrages in their consequences threaten to involve *the whole kingdom*, which shews as plain as words can express it, that they consider it as a partial confederacy; Mr. O'Leary exerting himself therefore in defence of a people who were not attacked, is like beating the air; or more properly, like the Jesuitical necromancy of raising the Devil on purpose to have the credit of laying him again.

I HAVE now done with Mr. O'Leary's cozening compliment, composed for the Dissenters, which is such a base prostitution of candour, and such a vile substitution for innocence as would condemn him before any tribunal upon earth: Nor would any Papal indulgence give it a currency in Heaven; for there the immaculate heart, and not the prevaricating tongue will be regarded. I think he ought to have a better knowledge of mankind, than to entertain the most distant hopes that such a dead lift would help him out of the mire of sedition. There are some Christians who embracing the doctrine of Predestination have warmed themselves into an opinion of their own election, consequently of their own impeccability. But if a man believes himself a Saint, because he wishes to be so, does he therefore become
a Saint

a Saint because he believes it? This would be a stretch of faith beyond the limits of Popery itself; much less I am sure will it prevail in politicks. Therefore if Mr. O'Leary depends upon a general opinion of his innocence from the working of his own imaginations, he will find himself confuted by a more general condemnation.

I SHALL now take my leave of Mr. O'Leary for the present in order to introduce Doctor Campbell and Mr. Barber to the acquaintance of the reader.

THESE Gentlemen have taken offence at the Bishop of Cloyne (seemingly) for two expressions, which they have endeavoured to twist and turn to an impeachment of the political principles of the Protestant Dissenters of Ireland. One of the expressions is this: *Of the three persuasions the members of the Established Church alone can be cordial friends to the entire constitution of this realm, with perfect consistency of principle; and without such consistency, no body of men (for we speak not of the particular characters of individuals) can be entitled to national confidence.* Now the foregoing expression, which is grounded upon demonstrative facts, as I shall presently make appear, has subjected the Bishop to the rage and rancour of the above-mentioned literary champions of the supposed insulted Dissenting loyalists of this kingdom. His Lordship hath been calumniated as exempting all the people of Ireland from the title of loyal subjects, excepting those of the Established Church. To support which the falsest quotations have been exhibited as from his pamphlet; and the most far-fetched and high-strained inferences have been drawn from the true ones.

THE Bishop in another place says that *the Established Clergy of this kingdom, may with confidence appeal*

peal to Government, and to their fellow subjects, for their zeal for the constitution; as well as for the example of a dutiful and orderly demeanor; which they uniformly have set to their parishioners, in the most disorderly and factious times.

THESE are the two obnoxious paragraphs which have raised the clamour of impeached innocence, against the Bishop; but with what justice we shall see presently.

BUT it may not be improper to observe here, that there must be something very sore in a people who can construe a candid appeal to Government from part of their fellow-subjects into an inuendo of their own disloyalty. This is something like the offence given to cripples by halting before them. There was a time indeed as Butler informs us

When men did swear to fight,
For the King's safety and his right;
And after marched to find him out,
And charged him home with horse and foot;
But yet still had the confidence,
To swear it was in his defence.

If these were the overturners of the Constitution who Dr. Campbell says robbed the Presbyterians of their privileges; it was certainly very treacherous of them to circumvent their coadjutors in that manner. But the Established Church neither had a hand in it, nor could prevent it; for she suffered still more than the Presbyterians, and was so near being annihilated by the same faction, that had not Providence interfered by removing Cromwell, and restoring the King, Episcopacy would be in as depressed a state in England and Ireland as it is at this day in Scotland.

THE iniquity of that whole business, and the destruction and slaughter that prevailed through the realm under the prevalency of *Fanaticism*, bears now so horrid an aspect, and is so generally reprobated, that the Presbyterians for the most part deny that any of their party were concerned in it.

To support this, they have recourse to a distinction without a difference. What difference there may be in their mode of worship, I know not; but their Church Government stood upon the same independent principles, which Mr. Barber contends for; and Dr. Campbell seems to acquiesce in, by not disproving. And of this the greater part of the Dissenters are so tenacious that it is a common declaration among them, that *if the religion of Scotland was established in Ireland they would dissent from it*. Can those then who detest all establishments be friendly to that of Ireland? This is all the Bishop of Cloyne contends for, that they are inimical to the Church Establishment; and innumerable instances may be brought from the annals of the kingdom from the first appearance of those Dissenters, taken under their different denominations, down to the present day. Let them have power and they never wanted the will to remove that *iniquity established by law*.

THOSE who declare themselves adverse to all establishments, cannot be pleased with any favours shewed by Government to one religion in preference to another. No concessions therefore can soften the tempers of such men, or reconcile them to a Government with which a Church Establishment is essentially connected. No indulgences will be sufficient to keep them steady friends, but as often as their interest or their humour stirs them, or upon the slightest whispers of discontent in others they are
ready

ready to join in the cry against the oppressive laws that provide for one part of the subjects at the expense of the other, especially in support of the Clergy of any religion in preference to their own.

IN this unrighteous cause the Presbyterians are ready to join hands with the Roman Catholics, though it were at the risque of raising Popery on the ruins of the Established Church. We have had an instance of this in the reign of the late King James, when the Dissenters were the first persons who addressed and caressed him, because he was granting an unlimited toleration, in order to sanction his intended introduction of Popery; and for this reason they were more especially taken notice of and preferred, whilst those of the Established Church were slighted and laid aside.

THE Bishop of Cloyne desires *not to be considered as applying his argument to the abstract truth of Dissenting principles, much less to an impeachment of their conduct, but merely to the effects which those principles, whether true or false, must naturally produce on their respective dispositions (and most strongly in minds of the greatest integrity) towards the present Constitution of this kingdom.*

WE have just now seen what effects they have in respect to a religious establishment. And as the Bishop has demonstrated beyond refutation the peculiar conformity between the Ecclesiastical and Civil Constitution, that the one was essential to the other, being united by the authority of the constitutional Legislature. And as at the Revolution, when our present unrivalled Constitution was finally settled, it was made a part of the Coronation Oath, that the King should to the utmost of his power maintain

the Protestant religion as by law established, and preserve to the Bishops and Clergy, and to the Churches committed to their care, all such rights and privileges as by law do, or shall appertain to them, or any of them. And as in the Act of Union between England and Scotland, it is enacted, that all the acts then in force for the establishment and preservation of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline and government thereof, shall be in force for ever. Every King or Queen at his or her Coronation, shall take and subscribe an oath to maintain and preserve inviolably the said settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, discipline and government thereof as by law established, within the kingdoms of England and *Ireland*, the dominion of Wales, the town of Berwick, and the territories thereunto belonging: That this act shall for ever be a fundamental and *essential* part of the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland.

THE Established Church then being thus made an essential part of the Constitution, guarded by laws of Parliament, oaths of Sovereigns, and treaties of Nations, and the Dissenters professing themselves inimical not only to it, but to all establishments, is it not with truth and justice that the Bishop affirms that Dissenters *cannot consistent with their principles be friends to the whole Constitution?*

THAT they are not so to the Ecclesiastical part of it, requires no proof, for they are forward enough to declare it. How far they are so to the Civil part I shall produce a few circumstances to determine.

THE good people of Boston are Dissenters upon the same independent principles as their ancestors under

under Cromwell, and as their present brethren in Ireland. Let us observe then the conduct and loyalty of these people when they perceived that they had it in their power to revolt from their obedience to Great Britain with probability of success.—Mr. Otis, who was one of their most eminent patriotick orators, harangued the people from the chair in Fancuil-Hall in these words ;

“ THE signs of the times are very alarming ; for information is received of troops coming from Halifax to be quartered in this town ; though I believe there is no such thing intended, there being no manner of occasion for them, yet it is necessary the inhabitants should arm themselves, as a French war would certainly commence soon, and the town might probably be invaded by a foreign enemy. Those who are not possessed of arms may be supplied from Fancuil-Hall, where the province arms are lodged. He concludes with telling his loyal townsmen, that in case Great Britain was not disposed to redress their grievances, they had then nothing else to do but to gird the sword on the thigh, and to shoulder the musket.”

So true is that observation of the Bishop of Cloyne, that *the Dissenters from the love of quiet, can acquiesce for a time in what they dislike, yet when a safe opportunity offers to give free scope, their principles will operate.* And so just is that other observation of his Lordship, that *the levelling principles of Presbyterians render them tenacious of the privileges of the subject.* To maintain the privileges of the subject is certainly very commendable, but I believe that was never done, by a levelling principle, for such a principle invariably terminates in licentiousness, under which no privilege was ever maintained but th

of acting according to the inclinations and powers of men.*

BUT it may be asked what have the Presbyterians of Ireland to do with the conduct of their brethren of Boston? Or why should the actions of the one be attributed to the other? Was ever any man or body of men accountable for the actions of another? Truly this ought not to be the case; but when those actions are publicly approved of and justified; then, though not actually committed, people will be apt to suspect, that the principles (though dormant) are the same, and that nothing is wanting but the sunshine of power to rouse them into action.

LET us see then how far the Presbyterians in Ireland have adopted and approved the conduct of their brethren in America.

IN the years 1783, 1784, and 1785, there was published a paper in Belfast, under the title of *The Belfast Mercury*, with an ostensible Editor under the name of *Tisdal*, but was generally supposed to be conducted by *Amyas Griffith*, but whether that was the case or not, it was always considered as under the patronage of the Volunteers; by whom we are to understand the Presbyterians of

* In popular assemblies there is not a folly, infirmity, or vice to which a single man is subjected, but what is more prevalent, for besides that such assemblies are composed of men with all their infirmities about them, they have also the ill fortune to be generally led and influenced by the worst among themselves. From whence it comes to pass that in their results we find the same spirit of cruelty and revenge, of malice and pride, the same ungovernable rage and anger, injustice and fraud, that ever lodged in the breast of an individual. (Contests and Diffentions in Athens and Rome.)

Ulster ;

Ulster; for such Mr. O'Leary, and such the Presbyterians themselves consider the Delegates of Dungannon to be. I shall give you a few extracts from this *loyal paper*, which I will take upon me to say no member of the Established Church would subscribe to.

“ THE apprehensions entertained of the principles and strength of the Volunteers have been justly considered as operating very powerfully on the Court and Parliament of Great Britain; and if Britain finds them in earnest about a Reform, and determined to have it at all events, she will most certainly acquiesce. She is still bleeding from the amputation she has suffered during a ruinous and bloody war; and she hath learned that expensive lesson from America not to go to war again with her friends. in the worst case that can happen succour is sure and success certain.”——(*Belfast Mercury*, Sept. 17, 1784.)

“ A subscription is set on foot at Newry, for providing the company with ball-cartridges, which will amount to 50 rounds a man.”——(*Bel. Mer.* May 14, 1784.)

To the Ulster Regiment.

“ I beg leave to lay one matter before you, the propriety of which is humbly submitted to your dispassionate reasons. What I allude to is the providing for the regiment a stock of ball-cartridges, and the speediest method you can adopt for the purpose.”——(*Bel. Mer.* May 5, 1784.)

“ The Volunteers of Armagh hold themselves in readiness with an hundred rounds of ball-cartridges to take the field on the shortest notice, in order to
co-operate

co-operate with the rest of the Volunteers to maintain the rights of Ireland."——(*Bel. Mer. May 28, 1784.*)

"How shall I in a few words address you, O ye glorious sons of liberty, so happily inspired,—by a kind Providence united!—Remember you are now to consider yourselves the only guardians and protectors of the rights and liberties of America. Remember also that the period draws near when perhaps the important point in question, whether America shall be for ever enslaved or remain free, must be finally decided."——(*Bel. Mer. July 27, 1784.*)

"Resolved unanimously, that the philanthropy of the French nation in its generous support of the rights of mankind, particularly instanced in their conduct to our American brethren, merits the warmest esteem and admiration of every Irishman."——(*Bel. Mer. May 7, 1784.*)

"It is in contemplation among the Leaders of the Independent Army to address that great friend to the liberties of mankind, Lewis the XVIth, peculiarly exemplified in the noble disinterested part he took in behalf of our dear brethren in America, when they groaned under the yoke of infatuated Britain. It will mark the Volunteer character in a superior colouring, surpassing even the transcendent lustre with which it has shone since the year 1778."——(*Bel. Mer. May 28, 1784.*)

"Six years ago the mention of sixty thousand Volunteers would create a laugh among the Minions of Court. But they should remember that what has been, may be. That it has been the familiar custom
of

of Britain to depose their Sovereigns when they have perverted the power that was given them.”——
(*Bel. Mer. Aug. 28, 1784.*)

“ There are fifteen thousand patriots armed in Ulster ; the province of Connaught is also in array ; and in Leinster and Munster the bands of freedom will not be tardy, so that with the French fleet we may defy Britain and the enemies of Ireland. It is recommended to the gallant Assertors of Liberty to seize the person of his G—ce, as an hostage for the conduct of the enemies. May the example of America stimulate Ireland, and may that injured country never relax until crowned with similar laurels of triumph.”——(*Bel. Mer. April 23, 1784.*)

I COULD give many more evidences of their civil principles, but I want to leave room for a few of their religious ones, which are as follow :

“ What good would the best laws in the world do us, if such an evil as a Rector remained to rob the poor ? for though an oppressive landlord must be allowed to be a fore evil, yet it is but a mole-hill to a mountain in respect of this other. But if we had a radical Reform these evils would certainly be removed, or else the poor would be little the better for every other good.”——(*Bel. Mer. Nov. 9, 1784.*)

“ Sure such another set of servants of the Devil as Rectors are not in the world—I wonder when such a thing as a Rector took place ?—But it is no matter when they were established, their oppressions and every other grievance will be done away if we get a Reform.”——(*Bel. Mer. Jan. 4, 1785.*)

“ If a Reformation takes place in the Commons, what in the name of wonder can preclude the Lords from enjoying the like advantage? If our Borough Representatives may be denominated the rotten part of the Commons, surely my Lords the Bishops may be deemed the most mortal part of the Peerage, though they compliment themselves with the appellation of Divine. To say the truth they are very nearly allied to corruption; and it would be only doing justice to confine them to spirituals and rid them of temporals.”—(*Bel. Mer. Oct. 24, 1783.*)

“ I appeal to the breast of every man, if it be not an intolerable grievance for men differing in religious persuasion from the Church of England, to be obliged to give away the tenth of their annual increase for nothing, and to be obliged to pay for instruction which their consciences would not suffer them to listen to. This evil is not incurable. The Volunteers of Ireland will undoubtedly concur—and who dare say their request will not be granted? They have always been prosperous in their undertakings, and I hope to see the day when that very infamous act will be totally repealed.”

I SHALL conclude these demonstrations of the enmity of the Presbyterians to our religious establishment with a form of prayer, which appeared in the same paper from whence I extracted the above paragraph.

“ O Divine! O Gracious and Omnipotent Volunteers! Ye powerful instruments in the hands of God to punish sinners, to redress grievances, and correct abuses; ye restorers of liberty to this abandoned isle; mercifully vouchsafe we beseech you,
according

according to your usual goodness, to look down with the eyes of pity and compassion on the poor afflicted sons of old Hibernia from the ever memorable and ominous Diet of Dungannon, your imperial seat: Relieve them in their necessities, repeal all barbarous laws against their interests, and grant them whatever you see them stand in greatest need of; for it is in you they put their trust and confidence, who in unity and conjunction with that noble Peer the celebrated Earl of Bristol, live and reign in Ireland now, and for ever more, world without end, Amen.”—(*Bel. Mer. Dec. 26, 1783.*)

THIS prayer is of so singular a texture, that some people may take umbrage at it. To prevent which therefore I shall contrast it by one of greater antiquity, uttered I dare say by as great a Divine as the person who composed the above.

“ O God, O God, many are the hands lift up against us, but there is one God; it is thou thyself O Father, who doest us more mischief than they all. O Lord, when wilt thou take a chair, and sit among the House of Peers? And when O God, when I say wilt thou vote among the Honourable House of Commons? We know O Lord that Abraham made a covenant, and Moses and David made a covenant, and our Saviour made a covenant, but thy Parliaments covenant is the greatest of all covenants. I say this is God’s cause, and if our God has any cause, this is it; and if this be not God’s cause, then God is no God for me, but the Devil is got up into Heaven. O Lord thou hast given us never a victory for a long while for our frequent fasting; what dost thou mean, O Lord, to fling us in the ditch and there leave us? Where is the God of Marston Moor; and
the

the God of Naseby, is an acceptable expostulation in a gloomy day? O what a catalogue of mercies has this nation attained to in time of trouble? God came from Naseby, and the holy one from the West, Selah. The armies fled, and were driven backwards, for they saw thee O Jesus! they saw thee appearing in the midst of us, so they fled before us."—(*Steny to the Com. 1645.*)

Dr. Campbell is as much offended as the Mercury Editor at the legal provision for the Established Church. The Bishop of Cloyne (says he) will find it very difficult to point out on just principles of policy, why the Episcopal Church should be exalted so very high, and the Presbyterian Church depressed so very low in this kingdom. But for my part I see no difficulty in settling the point at all. It is only supposing that the British policy prevailed here agreeable to the Act of Union; and it lies with the Doctor to shew if there is more injustice in that, than there was in exalting Presbyterianism and depressing Episcopacy in Scotland.

BUT the Doctor says, the Presbyterians settled in Ulster by an encouragement of Government upon a fair and equitable footing with the Church of England (I suppose he means, for at that time the Established Church was in a deplorable state in Ireland). He says that they had peculiar privileges which were torn from them by those men who overturned the Constitution. That they had a right to toleration (which by the bye is nonsense, for right and toleration are as opposite to each other as light and darkness, the one is a privation of the other) also of protection and support. That they were invited here to strengthen the hands of Government, and to support the Constitution, which they uniformly did,

did, and for which they have been persecuted by the Tories, and always protected by the Whigs.*

Now we have nothing but his bare word to support all this. Why does he not produce the instrument of Government which established the Presbyterians upon a footing with the Church of England? Why does he not mention the peculiar privileges, and by whom granted to them? Also who were the overturners of the Constitution, who robbed them of their privileges? Why does he not give us a copy of the invitation, and tell us what Constitution they were invited to support, whether that of England or Scotland? and who are the persons he means to characterise by those obsolete terms of High and Low Churchmen, Whig and Tory? He thinks the most minute exactness was necessary for the Bishop's credit, and supposes that the most desultory and slipshod assertions will do for his own.

THE encouragement which he says the Crown gave the Presbyterians to settle in Ireland amounted to no more than that of sending a detachment of

* The Dissenters (says Swift in his Sacramental Test) tell us of their merits in the late war in Ireland, and how cheerfully they engaged for the safety of the nation. Now not to trouble them about the Fly on the Wheel; I thought Liberty, Property and Religion had been the subjects of the quarrel; and have not all these been amply secured to them? Had they at that time a mental reservation for power and employments? When employments go a begging for want of hands, they should have the refusal, upon condition they will not pretend to them upon maxims that equally include Atheists, Turks, Jews, Infidels and Hereticks. If they will be satisfied with such a toleration as hath been granted them in England, the majority of both Houses will fall readily in with it; farther it will be hard to persuade them to go. For to say the truth we make a mighty difference here between suffering Thistles to grow, and wearing them for Posies.

soldiers

foldiers to enforce the authority of the Crown. Dr. Campbell indeed confesses this himself, when he tells us that James the First upon coming to the Throne, found Ireland in so distracted a state that they could not levy the revenues of the Crown nor execute the laws; nor protect the subject without military force. James therefore sent a regiment of his countrymen, as being a hardy race and fitter to cope with the Irish than soldiers born and bred in the milder and more indulgent climate of England. Religion was entirely out of the question in this case. And when the Doctor says that the Parliament of Ireland gave encouragement and invitation to the Scotch nation to settle in Ireland; this is no more than what all Governments do, under the circumstance of colonization, to the lower rank of citizens, whose fortunes were sufficiently mean to be bettered by a removal to any country. But the Doctor must needs have it that this invitation was given to the Scotch in order to promote the Reformed Religion. This is his *Ego Dico* without a single authority to support him.

If the propagation of the Reformed Religion had been one motive of inviting the Scotch over to Ireland, it certainly would have been held out by Government as the most tempting inducement to men so remarkably zealous in the principles of Calvinism, as to persecute Episcopacy with fire and sword in their own country. But not a syllable of this upon record; otherwise Doctor Campbell's diligence would have found it out, and his zeal would have published it.

BUT unless we can suppose a Parliament made up (almost to a man) of Episcopal members, and many of them rigid Roman Catholicks, to whom Presbyterianism

terianism did not appear in so favourable a light, as is now pretended, to be totally destitute of all religion, or indifferent about that which they had received from their ancestors. Unless we can suppose this, I say, we must suppose them to be abandoned of common sense and prudence, to invite a set of men to propagate a faith in this country which they were persecuting in their own. The improbability is too big to be removed by the bare word of Dr. Campbell, or by the faith of any but those of his own religious complexion.

* THE DOCTOR says the first Presbyterian Ministers came over with this colony under the sanction of Government, not as Dissenters from the Established Church, but rather as comprehended in it, being so far encouraged and supported by the State that all of them were inducted into the Churches, and had the Tithes.

SHALL I call this ignorance or a wilful misrepresentation of facts? One or other it is, and the Doctor may take his choice. By the laws upon which the Established Church is founded, no person can be inducted into a living but by the Bishop of the diocese to which the living belongs: And even that

* We observe (says Swift in his Sacramental Test) the Scots in our Northern parts to be a brave, industrious people, extremely devoted to their religion, and full of an undisturbed affection towards each other. Numbers of that noble nation, invited by a fertility of soil, are glad to exchange their barren hills of Louquabar, by a voyage of three hours, for our fruitful vales of Down and Antrim, so productive of that grain which finds diet and lodging for themselves and their cattle. They bring along with them from Scotland a most formidable notion of our Church, which they look upon at least three degrees worse than Popery, and it is natural it should be so, since they come over full fraught with that spirit which taught them to abolish Episcopacy at home.

the

the Bishop cannot do to any person who is not episcopally ordained; and no person without such a qualification and induction could legally claim the Tithes of the parish, or receive them except from the good-will of the parishioners; which though this might have been the case in a colony of Presbyterians, where there was no Established Clergyman, does not authenticate the Doctor's assertion that they were comprehended in the Established Church, but rather stamps an error on the face of it.

THE Doctor says that *Echlin Bishop of Down and Knox of Rapho joined with their Presbyteries in their ordinations*. If there is any truth in this, it clears up the seeming falsity of the other assertion; for if the Bishops were concerned in those ordinations, the persons on whom the Bishops laid their hands were episcopally ordained, and from thence became capable of being comprehended in the Established Church, might have been inducted, and legally entitled to Tithes; but then they ceased to be Presbyterian, and became Established Clergymen.

ENGLAND peopled her dominions in America by holding out such advantages as might encourage migration; but in all her indulgences we find no law to make provision for any denomination of Ecclesiasticks but those of the Church of England, which was made the Established Religion in all the colonies, the Massachusetts excepted, which were stocked with the descendants of those Regicides, who upon the restoration fled thither as an asylum from the vengeance that they knew was due, and they feared to meet with as the reward of their disloyalty and rebellion. These Sectarists, brooding on their enthusiasm, and bringing forth a multiplicity and variety of other Fanaticks, all congenial with
their

their forefathers, were suffered to walk after the ways of their own hearts ; and though but tolerated themselves, were so averse to toleration, that they opposed the settlement of an Episcopal Clergyman amongst them to the utmost of their power ; asking the Society for propagating the Gospel, *If they thought the Gospel was not preached among them before they sent a Missionary there ? and if it would be any great hardship if the few Episcopalians who lived amongst them had been left to serve God as they did ?* And when Great Britain confirmed to the Canadians the establishment of their religion agreeable to stipulation, they reprobated the measure, and declared it to be *establishing iniquity by law*, which is a common phrase of Independents all over Christendom.

THERE is such a thing as *the beauty of Holiness*, but what right these people have to assume it all to themselves, and like other beauties to grow insolent upon it, I know not, unless (as Pope observes of the Grand Turk) *they can bear no rival near the Throne*. Hence you hear them eternally trumpeting the superior spirituality of their religion, and branding publick rituals as carnal ordinances, derogatory to the spiritual kingdom of Christ. And hence it is that they claim those rights and indulgences which when in power they never granted to others.*

* Swift (in his Sacramental Test) says that the Libellers in his days whenever they got a tale by the end, without ever troubling their thoughts about the truth, always ended it with an application against the Sacramental Test. So likewise it may be observed, when the writers in favour of Dissention (especially those whose talents are of the lower sort) are engaged on any subject, they never fail to hook religion into the dispute ; and the superlative purity of their own, grounded on the paucity of their ceremonies, is always the burden of the song : And in this they are perfectly prudent, because it is a subject levelled to the lowest understanding. For such people hearing that ceremony and sincerity are incompatible principles, measure their proficiency in the one by their deficiency in the other.

BUT

But we shall see more of this spiritual superciliousness before we have done. Yet I cannot quit this subject of intolérance without taking notice of a note of a very singular nature which Dr. Campbell has added in his letter to the Bishop of Cloyne.

AFTER observing the injustice of imputing a spirit of persecution, to all religious sects when in power, which he calls a *levelling principle, and a fashionable one, assumed to evade difficulties, and to hide the defects of historical knowledge*, (which is quite consonant with the rules of civility observed by great scholars and great saints, to great scribblers and great sinners) he then in the name of the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland, challenges their adversaries, to produce an instance of any man *being fined, imprisoned, set in the pillory, losing his ears, suffering torture or death, because of his departing from their confession of faith?* This is a bold challenge, and yet so far as the Presbyterians of Ireland are concerned, it has some resemblance of a petulant school-boy who steps forward in the name of all his fellow scholars, and appeals to a man who kept an orchard in the neighbourhood of the school, if he and his associates did not demean themselves with great integrity and decorum in not robbing his orchard, when they could not do it but at the hazard of their lives, as the orchard was well fenced in with a high wall, and carefully guarded,

BUT in regard to Scotland this challenge carries in it an air of studied oblivion, or premeditated deception; for surely it is impossible that Dr. Campbell can be ignorant of the persecutions which the Roman Catholics underwent in Scotland so lately as the year 1778, when their Mass-houses were burned; their dwelling houses plundered, and their
persons

persons treated not only with the utmost indignities but severest cruelties, which were stopt only by the interposition of the military; and are the fiery principles of Lord George Gordon, and his numerous train of Dissenting zealots, so trifling a business as to deserve a Lethæan silence? If Dr. Campbell thinks so, he will find it difficult to bring the Roman Catholics of London into his opinion. I have no design to reflect upon Presbyterians, or to charge them with more cruelty than other Sectaries; my design is only to shew that their principles are not more tolerant, nor their practices more merciful than those of any other sect, consequently that they are no exception to the charge of a persecuting spirit in all religions when in power, and that it is no defect in historical knowledge to comprehend them in the charge.*

NOTWITHSTANDING the parliamentary encouragement, said by the Doctor to be given to the Scotch to settle in Ireland, it was a long time, it seems, before the utility of that measure was known, or at least publicly acknowledged in Ireland. Not till the 10th year of the reign of Charles the first, that

* There is one small doubt (says Swift in his Sacramental Test) I would willingly be satisfied in, that is, whether these same Protestants (the Dissenters) when they have, by their dexterity, made themselves the National Religion, and disposed the Church-revenues among their Pastors, will be so kind to allow us Dissenters, I do not say a share in employments, but a bare toleration by law. The reason of my doubt is because I have been so very idle as to read above fifty pamphlets, written by as many Presbyterians, loudly disclaiming this idol *toleration*, and all agreeing it was *establishing iniquity by law*. Now I should be glad to know when and where their successors have renounced this doctrine. Because I should be sorry to see my poor Titular Bishop seized on by mistake in the dark for a Jesuit, or be forced myself to keep a Chaplain disguised like my butler, and steal to prayers in a back-room, as my grandfather used in those times when the *Church of England* was malignant.

is 33 years after their first settlement, was it thought proper to give them further encouragement by a Naturalization Bill, and what is very remarkable, the Parliament in that bill particularizing the usefulness of the Scotch, pays no compliment to their religious principles as tending to promote the Protestant interest, but confines their utility to that of their strengthening and securing the realm against rebels at home, and all foreign invasion. This, as the Doctor observes, is certainly an ample testimony of their loyalty and usefulness. But who has impeached them? Not the Bishop of Cloyne, nor any body else that I know of in this controversy. His Lordship confines his whole charge to their dislike of the Ecclesiastical Establishment, which they honestly confess themselves, and which the Doctor, under the influence of that dislike, has taken great pains to prove is no way essential to the Constitution.

To maintain this he begins with a quibbling sneer, below his learning and gravity. He observes that the Bishop of Cloyne has not fixed the Ecclesiastical Establishment to any period, that is (as he intimates a little lower down in the same page) the Bishop has not declared whether he means the *Ecclesiastical Establishment settled by Magna Charta*, or that settled by *Henry the Eighth*, or that of his daughter *Mary*, or that by *Elizabeth*? To this I answer neither of these; but his Lordship means the present establishment, which is a gradual and noble improvement of the whole; and which (as his Lordship observes) *has been studied with a peculiar degree of exactness*, constituting such a system of conformity between the Ecclesiastical and Civil parts, that the one is so far essential to the other, that like twin-sisters, they live and die together, as is evident from their mutual rise and fall in the Revolutions of the last century.

To

To confute this the Doctor tells us that *the Britannick Constitution flourished in great vigour many ages before the Reformation*. Here the Doctor seems to have fallen into the same inaccuracy that he blames in the Bishop, for he has not told us what he means by a *flourishing Constitution*; whether he wishes us to apply that term to the lives, liberties, and properties, secured to the subject by impartial and wholesome laws? This is certainly the noblest characteristick of a national Constitution, and if he means this, I will take it upon me to say that all his boasted historical knowledge cannot produce a single reign wherein the Britannick Constitution flourished in great vigour before the Reformation.

I AM considering a constitution merely civil without any thing spiritual being blended with it, which is a scheme as perfectly chimerical as ever sprung from the brain of a Bedlamite or a Barber, there being no dominion to be found of that stamp. But if religion is taken into the account, and this admitted to be Popery, then what becomes of the Doctor's *flourishing Constitution*?

BUT the Doctor's wonderful acumen in discovering an oversight in the Bishop must not be unnoticed, for the honour of his critical talents. He observes that the Bishop, after laying it down that the Ecclesiastical Establishment is an essential part of the Constitution, says, *the kingdom of Scotland may perhaps be held forward in opposition to these principles, but that a single exception is never a fair objection to a general rule*. This the Doctor has found out to be an inconsistency in reasoning, as it is alledging that *any thing can exist without what is essential to it*. And in the triumph of his heart on this wonderful discovery he runs into a sarcasm, and says that in

any other subject this would be looked upon as a contradiction in terms, but *where Ecclesiastical authority is concerned it may be sometimes a merit to assert and believe what is unintelligible.*

Now *the importance of a man to himself* is so very laughable an affair, that I never attempt to mortify him, provided he keeps within the bounds of good nature. But when he shews an inclination to be rude under his imaginary superiority, it may do him a service to clap a curb upon his vanity.

THE Bishop said that the Ecclesiastical (meaning the Episcopal) Establishment is an essential part of the Constitution; that upon the suppression of Episcopacy in Scotland at the Revolution, it could not be supposed that the ascendancy of the Presbyterian Church in the smaller country could effect Monarchy in the two kingdoms whose Crowns were united. That therefore Episcopacy which was the Established religion in England, and Presbyterianism which prevailed in Scotland, were made the fundamental and essential parts of the Treaty of Union.

THE Bishop did not say that Episcopacy was so essential to Scotland, that there could be no Constitution without it; but he said it was an essential part of the Constitution of England, repeating the express words of *the Treaty of Union*. And as to the supposed impropriety of saying *a thing can exist without what is essential to it*, there is no impropriety in it at all; for if in the body natural every limb is essential to the formation of a complete man, and yet a man may exist with the loss of one or more of his limbs; so in the body politick, though a particular establishment, which is a limb of the Constitution, may be cut off, yet the body politick may exist and even

even operate in that maimed state, as a man who loses his leg makes a tolerable shift to walk about with a wooden one. Whether this is the case of Scotland or not is perfectly problematical. There are as many wise men on one side of the question as there are on the other; and if it was put to the vote in this kingdom and the Roman Catholics allowed a suffrage, notwithstanding the *cater-cozenship* of Mr. O'Leary, it would be no hard matter to tell on which side the question would be decided.

So far, I fancy the reader will be convinced that there is no impropriety in the word *essential*, and that every age will verify that adage of Butler's

That fools are known by looking wise,
As men find wadcocks by their eyes.

BUT the question is, whether any religious Establishment is necessary at all? Mr. Barber says no. And nine-tenths of the Dissenters in Ireland are of the same opinion, as will appear by a letter wrote by a Mr. Byrch to the Lord Lieutenant, resigning a dividend of £13 14s. 6d. a year allotted to him as one of the Dissenting Ministers of Ulster by the Synod, to whom the disposal of part of the Royal bounty to the Presbyterian Clergy of Ireland was committed. This letter is so very modest and disinterested, that I think it would not be doing Mr. Byrch justice to conceal it from the publick.

“ May it please your Excellency,

“ As religion is a personal thing between a man and his Maker, for which he alone must be accountable, and by which he cannot possibly injure the community, provided he continues amenable to the rules of civil government, I would apprehend that
the

the imposing any forfeiture upon man upon account of his religious sentiments, or obliging him to support a Church where he cannot worship (without his receiving a like return) though he gives the highest evidence of his loyalty and subjection to the civil power, is a bad way of making profelytes—hurts the finer feelings of the mind—is highly unreasonable in a Church acknowledging fallability—favours of persecution—is contrary to the sound policy and practice of the most civilized Heathen and Mahometan nations, and diametrically opposite to the mild spirit of the Gospel, and the precepts of its Divine Author, who has strictly enjoined his followers not to exercise lordly authority over one another, but to treat each other as brethren—And has been attended with the worst consequences in this kingdom.

“ MAY it please your Excellency, for these reasons I resign into your hands, as the Representative of Majesty, the thirteen pounds fourteen shillings a year Royal bounty which I am entitled to as a Dissenting Minister, and which in conscience I cannot receive, as thereby more than two-thirds of the Christians in this kingdom (who are not of my religious sentiments) are taxed for my support, without receiving any return: And even allowing the tax was just, yet it appears to be particularly faulty, as there is enough (if equitably distributed) wherewith to support all the officiating Clergy in the kingdom, without laying any additional burden upon a people already too much oppressed.

“ I SHALL therefore rather content myself with suffering with the distressed, than enjoy gain for a season with a bad conscience, by assisting to accumulate misery, trusting that God in his Providence,
by

by the wisdom and magnanimity of the Prince and the virtue and spirit of the people, will shortly bring it about that instead of artful men being suffered to foment divisions to the ruin of the country, those of every profession who equally fear God and work righteousness, according to the light they enjoy, will be equally supported and protected in this nation as they are equally accepted of in the kingdom above.

THOMAS LEDLIE BYRCH."

Nov. 29, 1784.

IF any letter was distinguishable for its malapertness and absurdity, this surely is the most remarkable. The Lord Lieutenant knew no more of Mr. Byrch than he did of any petty constable in the county; nor had he any more to do with his dividend of the royal bounty than the Hearth-money Collector; therefore Mr. Byrch's resigning it into the hands of this last would be as proper as into the hands of his Grace. But the man wanted to make a shew of Spiritual disinterestedness by this artful manœuvre. He for many years partook of the royal bounty without any squeamishness of conscience; but as it were by a miraculous illumination becomes so great a patriot and philanthropist, that he would not take the fiftieth part of a mite from any man to whom he did not make a return by his Spiritual instructions. The truth of the matter is this: The Delegates were soon to meet in Congress, and the idea of their wisdom and prowess had raised mighty hopes of a Constitutional Renovation. The newspapers were filled with didactic sentiments of Dissenting Constituents, from the supposition that the Legislature must bow down before such awful and tremendous authority; for who dare oppose what they should think proper to propose.

BUT I shall paraphrase the foregoing letter for the benefit of my less intelligent readers.

" May

“ May it please your Excellency,

“ THOUGH every man gets his religion by the accidental circumstances of local birth, prejudiced parentage, or juvenile instruction, to which reason or scriptural researches contribute nothing; yet this religion however acquired becomes a personal thing between a man and his Maker: That law therefore which forces one man to pay another for prayers, that he cannot, consistent with that conscience which his father gave him, attend to, is anti-scriptural and iniquitous. It is like forcing physick down the throat of a healthy man, and afterwards obliging him to pay the physician. It is contrary to the precepts of Christ, who strictly enjoined his followers not to execute lordly authority over one another; that is not to force a man to say his prayers, or to pay another for praying in a different manner from that which had been taught him in his youth. Heathens and Mahometans are too just to act in this manner.

“ MAY it please your Excellency, for the above reasons, I resign into your hands, as the Representative of Majesty, the thirteen pounds fourteen shillings which I have hitherto received from the royal bounty. But as the King's purse is replenished by taxes on the people, and as the people are already too much oppressed by taxes, however unscrupulous the King may be in burdening the people, my conscience will not suffer me to add to that burden by receiving a single mite from any person to whom I do not make an equivalent return in Gospel ordinances.

“ IT is not material from what tax the royal bounty flows, it is sufficient to know there is a fault in bestowing it; because the Tithes allotted to the Established Clergy would, if equally divided, be an
ample

ample maintenance for all the officiating Clergy of every denomination in the kingdom, without laying any additional burden upon the people, already too much oppressed. Rather therefore than accumulate misery, I shall content myself with suffering with the distressed for a season, which I trust in God will not be long; because the King is of too great and noble a mind to be bound down by his Coronation oath; especially when the interest of the reformers of this pretended reformed Church, and the scruples of so great and respectable a number of his subjects as the Independents are, call upon him to lay aside all scruples of his own, that may obstruct the interest of Heaven, by not placing Presbyterianism and Popery upon a level with the Established Church.

“ BUT I don’t build my hopes entirely on the Prince, I have a great dependance on the virtue and spirit of the people now armed as Volunteers, whose Delegates are soon to meet in Congress, and who will shortly bring it about that instead of artful men of the Episcopal tribe being suffered to foment divisions to the ruin of the country, those of every profession who equally fear God and work righteousness, according to the light they enjoy, will be equally supported and protected in this nation, as they are equally accepted in the kingdom above.”

THIS is as fair and candid a paraphrase as can be made on this absurd letter, and ostentatious insignificance, in which I have been assisted by the Belfast Mercury of February 22^d 1785, wherein a body of Dissenters denominated Seceders, (some of whom having signed the County of Down counter-petition relative to a reform in Parliament) have been charged with perjury in breaking the solemn league and covenant of the Ulster Synod, whereby they had engaged to oppose Prelacy and Popery. For (as
their

their accuser declares) if they had not betrayed their religion for a paltry salary of £14 a year, they might have enjoyed a portion of the emoluments already set apart for the support of religion, and not have added £500 a year to the pension list, which the nation is already unable to support. Which words bear so close a connection with the letter of resignation, that they may be fairly attributed to one and the same author. But be that as it may, no words can more strongly paint the expectations of the Independents of Ulster in their favourite Parliamentary Reform. The civil liberties of the nation in general, was (if at all) but a secondary consideration, to the portion of Tithes which their sanguine hopes led them to be confident of receiving through the terror, which they vainly supposed Government would be under from the arms of Volunteers. And I am further strengthened in my opinion of the justice of this paraphrase by the Belfast Mercury of the 26th of July 1785, wherein the following propositions are maintained :

FIRST, That it is unlawful for the Clergy of any Presbyterian Society, especially for those who have lifted up their testimony for a covenanted Reformation, to receive any donation less or more from the present Supreme Magistrate.

SECONDLY, That obedience even to good and wholesome and salutary laws, made by the present Civil Government, is inconsistent with the said testimony, and direct rebellion against Christ the King of Zion.

THIRDLY, That as the present Supreme Magistrate is not possessed of such a measure of Spiritual qualifications, as gives sufficient ground to think that
he

he holds his office from Christ as Mediator; obedience to him in any thing is an infringement of the Crown, rights and prerogatives of our Lord Jesus Christ as Head of the Church.

FOURTHLY, That Magistracy is derived from, and Magistrates hold their offices under, Christ as Mediator.

THESE are such genuine and unadulterated Oliverian doctrines, as leaves no room for confidence in the loyalty of those who embrace them; and yet no people are more warm in their professions, nor more impatient under suspicion of their loyalty. Offer the slightest intimation of the loyalty and peaceable demeanour of any set of men out of their own community—it is too much—they instantly take umbrage, suppose themselves attacked, and like *the wicked flee when no man pursueth*.

BUT to return.—In regard to religious establishments, I must observe that every Constitution has two component parts, the one civil which regards the temporal; and the other spiritual which promotes the eternal concerns of men. We read of no nation governed by laws without these conjunct principles: Even in States where extraordinary revolutions have taken place, such regard has been paid to religion as to blend it with the new police, and protect it by suitable laws. This I think is a fair argument that the civil and religious parts of a Constitution are essential to each other; and as far as this universal maxim of nations can throw any weight into the scale of propriety, must condemn the professed enemies of all religious establishments; and this I am persuaded, will comprehend nine-tenths of the Dissenters where Dissention prevails.

Doctor

Doctor Campbell however renounces *Independence*, and has no objection to an establishment, but would have his own to be the Church. Thus whilst Mr. Barber and his adherents are for making every village a *See*, the Doctor and his friends are for making every *See* a *Synod*: And they are so prepossessed of the superior purity of their religion, that they expect the laws of every country should put them upon a level, if not give them an ascendancy over every other persuasion. But despairing to accomplish this, the Doctor grows angry with the Bishop for shewing (as he has done to the conviction of those who are not blinded by prejudice) the close connection between the civil and ecclesiastical constitution in every country; and for pointing out the peculiar circumstances which makes the ascendancy of the present Established Church in this kingdom more essentially interesting to the landed Gentlemen, the Protestant Government, and the British empire.

RATHER than such importance should be annexed to the Episcopal Establishment, he is disposed to forego all Establishments; and the more effectually to depreciate the present, he ransacks the annals of Popish reigns, and fills about forty pages (that is near two-thirds of his pamphlet) in recounting the intolerance, tyranny, and oppression of Priests, their insolent behaviour to Princes, their trampling under foot the laws of the land, and their subversion of kingdoms: And to complete the catalogue of the supercilious enormities of Priests, he spends no less than six pages in a biographical account of two Popish Bishops *St. Athanasius* and *St. Thomas a Becket*, whose bigoted zeal is as much condemned by the Established Church of Ireland as by that of Scotland: And all this detail of ecclesiastical *mal'versation* is designed (as he declares himself) to shew the danger of trusting
power

power in the hands of Ecclesiasticks of any denomination; and that the boasted religious establishment is capable of defeating all the good purposes which the Bishop alledges it is fitted to produce.

Do but observe (candid reader) the inconsistency of this episcopal opponent. In order to contradict the Bishop's assertions, that the present Establishment is an essential part of the Constitution of England, he says that the Constitution flourished in great vigour many ages before the Reformation; and yet he distinguishes those ages as suffering under the oppressive tyranny of bigoted Ecclesiasticks, who lorded it over the consciences, pillaged the purses, and trampled on the liberties of the people; and all this for the sake of a supposition that the same spirit prevails in the Established, though no Church upon earth shews so little of it; neither could it exert that spirit if so disposed, because (as the Doctor himself observes) *the power and domination of Ecclesiasticks was checked at the Revolution; and by the wisdom of the present Royal Family, moderate Churchmen being advanced and countenanced, the nation has enjoyed more internal peace and security than in any period since the foundation of the monarchy.* So that the flourishing and vigorous Constitution in the days of Becket, is now by political flattery and spiritual *hocus pocus* brought forward to our own times, which are rendered more happy by that very Establishment which the Doctor is decrying, and would have abolished to make room for intolerant Calvinism.

SUCH is the accurate reasoning of Dr. Campbell, for which he received an Address from the Sub-Synod of Londonderry, in the following words :

“ Rev.

“ Rev. Sir,

“ WE would be conscious of a defect in our estimation of merit, and of a lukewarmness to the duties of our station, did we not embrace the opportunity which our annual Meeting affords of expressing our warm and hearty approbation of your vindication of the principles and character of the Presbyterians of Ireland from the very injurious calumnies artfully suggested, and industriously circulated by the Bishop of Cloyne.

“ AMBITIOUS short-sighted mortals may triumph for a time in the imagined success of an unjustifiable expedient; but the Disposer of all events, who maketh the wrath of man to praise him, often orders it so, that the very measures which are taken for the suppression of truth, should be converted into means of its establishment and support.

“ THE Rev. Prelate had the mortification to find that the publication of his opinions has ultimately tended to confirm the reputation of the people whom he meant to depress. In this kingdom among candid and thinking men, there is but one opinion of his Lordship's pamphlet: Every dispassionate Churchman concurring with his Presbyterian neighbour in condemning its principle and lamenting its temerity; and though it may have gained a momentary credit in our sister nation, where our history and conduct are less known, yet we rejoice in the confidence of our vindication following after, and like a Restoring Angel, repairing the ravages of a Destroying Spirit. We are, Rev. Sir, with every sentiment of esteem, your affectionate brothers. Signed by order,

HUGH BROOKE, Moderator.
JOHN LAW, Clerk.”

Now

Now if the beginning of the above Address is not absolute nonsense, it is as compleat a piece of jargon as ever flowed from the ideas of a school-boy. It says that they would not have known that they were judges of merit, had not their Annual Meeting given them an opportunity of approving of the vindication. If it will bear any other sense or paraphrase, I shall be glad to hear it for the honour of this learned body; but till then I think some sense may be made of it by substituting the word *betray* for that of *conscious*. But indeed the whole stile of the Address sufficiently shews the temper of the people; and it is much to be doubted whether any thing recorded of the furious Becket can exceed it in insolence. I shall treat it with the ridicule it deserves by travestying the well-known gingle of the men of Coventry:

Ye Synod-Deputy,
Of the town of Derry,
With a Beam in your eye,
Which makes you look awry,
And run from Verity,
Into a plaguy lie,
On Episcopacy,
And without modesty,
Temper or Oratory,
Make Campbell cut and dry,
Prove out of History,
That your own Presbytery,

Free from all flattery,
Always shewed loyalty,
To the King's Majesty,
Whilst the Church Hierarchy,
Still in his face did fly,
And did for ever try,
To suppress Liberty,
All which is Perfidy,
Which nobody can deny,
Who will impartial spy,
The Acts of last Century,
For which every one must cry,
O fy, Sirs! O fy, fy.

YET this Address which charges the Bishop with *injurious calumnies artfully suggested*, and which contrary to truth and the Bishop's own declaration, impudently declares the Bishop's intention to depress the reputation of the Presbyterians;—and that *every dispassionate Churchman condemned his Lordship's pamphlet*. This Address made up of lies and ill language, was answered by the Doctor with grateful acknowledgments for so honourable a testimony
from

from men whom he so highly esteemed, for calling him a *Restoring Angel* and the Bishop a *Destroying Spirit*.

It is certainly a pity to spoil all these fine compliments between kindred votaries, especially when they are not likely to get them from any other quarter. Yet for the vindication of insulted Prelacy, and the honour of a cautious champion of our Established Christianity, it is necessary to declare that there is not a dispassionate Churchman in Ireland who does not highly approve of the Bishop's pamphlet and its principles; and there are many both Laymen and Churchmen in Ireland who are able, and, if occasion should offer, willing to take up the cause where the Bishop left it, and to prove from authentick records, that the Dissenters from the Established Church both in England and Ireland have demonstrated by their conduct (ancient and modern) that they do not deserve the encomiums they bestow upon themselves as loyal and peaceable subjects.

I HAVE already given two confirming proofs of this assertion from the conduct of the Scotch in the year 1778, and that of Lord George Gordon in the year 1780. I have given several instances of their good inclinations to the Church and State by several extracts from the publick prints in the years 1783, 1784, and 1785, to all which I shall take the liberty to add one question: Was it not under the prevalence of the Presbyterian and Independent principles that the Parliament in the last century voted the House of Lords uselefs, forced them from the House, murdered the King, executed thousands of their fellow-subjects (many of them the prime Nobility) for their loyalty, overturned the whole Constitution, established the Excise, by which and other taxes they raised

raised more money and oppressed the people more during the usurpation, than all the Kings had done for double the space of time?

If it be said that these were the works of Independents, let me then ask another question: Was the Scotch army in whose fidelity the King confided, and to whom he fled for refuge from his fanatick and rebellious subjects in England, (as being a Scotchman born) was this army, I say, who basely and treacherously sold and delivered their native King up to his enemies, who afterwards put him to death, were these, I ask, Independents also? That man will make no scruple of asserting any thing, who after this abominable breach of honour, will assert that the loyalty of the Presbyterians was never impeached.

I SHOULD now consider this as sufficient to balance the account of loyalty with the Doctor, and should quit the topick, had he not referred us to some transactions in this kingdom, which (when the truth is told) will not appear in such fair colours as he has thought proper to give them.

In support of the loyalty of the Presbyterians to the unfortunate King Charles the First, he says, that the Presbyterians refused the oath called the *Engagement*, which abjured the ancient constitution of King, Lords and Commons. And this he expects us to believe on his own bare affirmation, for he has given us no historical authority to support it. On the contrary, Warner in his History of the Civil War in Ireland tells us, that Monroe the Scotch General, receiving a commission at the end of April from the Parliament in England, under the new Great Seal, to command all the forces in Ulster, his

- I

moderation

moderation against the interest of the King was at an end. That this General and most of the Officers of the old Scotch Regiments took the oath, notwithstanding his Majesty in a proclamation declared it *a traiterous and seditious combination against him*. That four Kirk-Ministers were sent over to the army, who divided themselves about the country, and met with astonishing success, the common people, as well as soldiers, taking the oath with as much zeal as if it was the only means of preserving both their souls and their bodies.

Now whether this account of loyalty proceeds from historical ignorance or party prejudice in the Doctor, I won't take it upon me to say; but I am inclined to think the latter: Because he who could take it upon him to arraign the Bishop's historical proficiency, must either have a large share of his own, or an uncommon share of effrontery in taking the lead of his Lordship in that science. This however I may venture to say, that both parts of a contradiction cannot be true; and if the Doctor has thought proper, upon his own authority, to assert what is point blank contradicted by publick records, no compliment of his compeers will give a currency to his assertions. But as in religion the hypocrite is often discovered by some lapses of his conduct, so likewise in politicks the uncandid is frequently betrayed by the lapses of his pen. Perhaps the Doctor in the case before us will be found to confirm this observation.

AFTER displaying the attachment of Presbyterians to their King and Country, in the strongest characteristics of loyal subjects and virtuous citizens, declaring that they preached and prayed for the King, asserted his title upon all occasions, pressed others to
be

be loyal, refused to abjure him, were banished, reviled, sequestered, imprisoned, miserably harrassed and oppressed for him, faced the greatest dangers with fortitude not to be shaken by all the horrors of a military Government, which was a terror to the greatest crowned heads in Europe. Now after all this matchless detail of suffering, loyalty and patriotism, (which by the bye can be traced no where else but in the Doctor's pamphlet) who would have imagined that these very men should not only lose the reward of their suffering zeal, but should be reviled and harrassed, be turned out of their places in Church and State, and have laws enacted against them, whereby they were rendered incapable of serving that country which they boast to have saved to the Crown. This is such an instance of ingratitude, and such a solecism in politicks, as I believe cannot be fixed on any other Government upon the face of the earth; and for the honour of England it is to be hoped it never prevailed there. I am sure she has shewed a different disposition towards her suffering friends in America, which makes it more than probable that this treatment was grounded on a conduct the reverse of that ascribed to them by their Apologist.

It may be said that Government did not make the distinction that Dr. Campbell makes between Presbyterians and Independents, but jumbled them all together, as joint Regicides and Subverters of the Constitution. But one would imagine that in a matter of such importance to a State as that of rewarding the faithful and punishing the rebellious subject, the strictest care would be taken not to confound the one with the other. And if we can suppose that the same discretion and equity which would govern the conduct of a private individual in

the distribution of rewards, would be observed by the reigning powers of a State, this will sufficiently account for those rigorous laws complained of by the Doctor, and at the same time it throws the weight of credit into the historick scale: For that question of St. Peter is as apropos in politicks as in religion—*Who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good; for Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil?* And to this sacred expostulation, I shall take the liberty of subjoining a few political ones. How many Protestant Episcopalians have been impeached as Subverters of the Constitution? How many have been concerned in the murder of Kings? How many Acts of Oblivion have been made on their account? Where have they been found abetting rebellion? What reign has been marked by their sedition? And what Government (except that of the usurpation) have they opposed or disturbed?—An impartial answer to these queries will account for all those severe laws, and rigorous measures of Government complained of by the Dissenters.

BUT there is another observation of the Doctor's which must be not left unnoticed. He says the principles and conduct of Presbyterians are no less strongly marked by the ill treatment they received, than by the protection they have met with, as they have always been persecuted by the Tories, and protected by the Whigs. By the Tories (as appears in another page) he means the Episcopal Clergy; at the head of whom he places a Primate, whom he calls a bigoted Churchman and a creature of Land, whom he assisted in his violent measures against the Presbyterians: And these violent measures, he tells us, was that of turning the Presbyterian Ministers out of livings which they held from their first settlement

ment in the kingdom, and usurping the Tithes. Whether these four Kirk Ministers who divided the province of Ulster between them, and went about preaching sedition, and recommending the Covenant, were among the number of the mal-treated or not, we are left to conjecture. But I must repeat a remark, which I have already made, and that is, that these Dissenting Ministers had no other right to Tithes than what flowed from the bounty of their congregation. That if in that unsettled state of Civil and Ecclesiastical affairs they claimed and did receive them, it was just as the Independents did in England, who under the predominance of Puritanism (which the Doctor considers as synonymous with Presbyterianism) usurped them from the Episcopal Clergy, who being the only legal proprietors of them, claimed and took possession of them upon the return of Monarchy and the revival of the abolished Constitution.

BUT who he means by those Whigs or illustrious characters who considered the Presbyterians as a set of men whom they could trust with entire confidence, he has not thought proper to tell us. If he means that species of Whigs which may be properly called Republican, and are always violent for a change of Government suitable to such principles, perhaps he may be right. We have some such men amongst us now, who make no secret of avowing their approbation of the conduct of those Subverters of Monarchy under the prevalence of Cromwell. These Whigs have all along appeared as the advocates for making America independent of Great Britain: And in the war which terminated in that independence, shewed publick rejoicings upon every account of success which attended the united arms of France and America to accomplish that end. Many
of

of these men are the identical Presbyterians whose loyalty the Doctor is so strenuously asserting, and some of them whom I could mention by name, fellow-labourers with the Doctor in preaching the Gospel.

THE Doctor says that the Presbyterians were active and zealous in promoting the Restoration, and that none rejoiced more than they did at the revival of the ancient Constitution. He had before told us that they gave steady opposition to Cromwell and the Republick. This likewise he expects to be credited upon his bare assertion; but not only history but probability is against him. The Dissenters of every denomination had no reason to complain of the arbitrary measures of Cromwell; they had every favour and indulgence they could wish for. They had not only got the Established Church under their feet, but it was almost annihilated, and had Cromwell lived a few years longer he would have compleated its overthrow, which was what he had violently laboured to effect. How then could the Presbyterians be supposed to have a predilection for the limited Monarchy of England, when Episcopacy was one branch of that Monarchy, the restoration of which would have subjected them to those restraints (or persecutions as they call it) which had been, and continues to be the subject of their complaints under every Monarch?

THE Presbyterians indeed being out-numbered by the furious and resolved Independents, and secluded from any share in the Government by Colonel Pride, who had violently turned them out of the House of Commons; finding their hopes of ruling, or at least of jointly ruling the State entirely blasted, whether through resentment or necessity, deserted their old Independent Coadjutors, and joined to the
Royalists

Royalists formed a decisive majority in favour of the King. And so far (as the Doctor says) they may be said to give *opposition to the Rump Republic*.

BUT the Restoration was planned and effected by Monk, scarce any of the Members knowing any thing of that General's intentions, till they were informed that Sir John Granville was at the door of the House with a letter from the King. The Members had neither time nor opportunity for debating, the General with his army was at hand, a moment's pause was scarce allowed, Granville was called in, the King's letter read, and his proposals unanimously accepted. This is the account given us of the Restoration by the best historians of those times. So that the Presbyterians instead of being active and zealous in that business, can only be said to concur with other Members in a question they had not been apprised of, and did not know how far they could oppose it with safety.

BUT the Scotch Declaration 1650 plainly shews that the Restoration was brought about contrary to the wishes of the Presbyterians, for the 23^d page contains the following words: *Charles the Second, the son of a bloody father, heir to an entailed curse, more certain than to his kingdom, trained up in blood, and one that never sucked any other principles than prerogative and tyranny.* And in another publication called *The Door of Hope*, he is called *the son of a murderer, whose throne is built upon the blood of Saints and Martyrs.* Such as Mr. Barber has placed under the altar; and with a spirit peculiar to themselves, but repugnant to that of the meek and forgiving Jesus, who prayed for his murderers; expostulate with the Almighty for not avenging their cause, by suffering the bloody designs of miscreants to effect the overthrow of the present Establishment. I can't help taking notice of
 a singular

a singular remark of Mr. Barber's: After making his Saints cry from the Altar, *How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell upon the earth?* He then says, *Such a Church and such a Prince, when they had filled up the measure of their iniquity, fell together, &c.* This he considers as a sign of God's displeasure; which if it was the case, God of his infinite mercy thought proper to remove in a very few years; whereas the depression of the sons of those saints and possessors of their principles has now continued above a century, and the deliverance they are looking for may perhaps accompany that of the Jews.

WHEN the Presbyterians had the Prince with them in Scotland, where they could oppose him with safety, they did it effectually, by making the terms of his admission to the Throne so severe, that he must renounce the better half of his dominions to comply with them, and upon his refusal, being apprehensive of his safety, and knowing that his father had been betrayed by them before, made some attempt to escape out of their hands. Is it probable then that men whose attachment to their religious principles prompted them to take such an advantage of an unfortunate Prince, should, after all, act with such zeal and vigour in restoring him, and with him the ascendancy of a religion which they wished to extirpate? The supposition carries an absurdity upon the face of it; and yet this is one of the truths which the Deputy-Synod of Derry (as clear-sighted as the Ass upon which Baalam rode) saw the *Restoring Angel* preserving from the ravages of a *Destroying Spirit*.

AFTER the Restoration (however, or by whomsoever effected) the State being long harassed by war

war and faction, and the Constitution totally overturned, there was no bringing it into its pristine form, without such measures as could not be universally pleasing to the people. Some vengeance it was thought necessary, should be taken of those who had been accessory to the late King's death, and to the calamities in which the nation had been involved. But out of four-score of those who sat in judgment on the King, ten only were executed. And though Prelacy and the ceremonies of the Church of England were restored, yet a general toleration, so far as related to modes of worship, was allowed. And as for oppression which the Doctor says the Church was not ashamed to lay on the Presbyterian Clergy, by usurping the Tithes, this was only to restore the old sequestered Incumbents, who under the usurpation of Cromwell had been banished from them. But by an act of uniformity, still in force, such of the Presbyterian Clergy as chose to be episcopally ordained, and were willing to conform to the ceremonies of the Church, were suffered to remain in those livings that were not claimed by their former Incumbents, many of whom had died during the sequestration. This, one would imagine, was as much as could be granted consistent with the rights of an Established Religion.

BUT why should there be an Established Church at all, says Mr. Barber, since the Church of Christ in its infant state prevailed, not only without, but even contrary to the wishes of, the Civil Magistrate, and has the promise of Christ that it shall still do so? To this I answer that when the Church of Christ prevailed against all the powers of the Earth, it was because it had all the powers of Heaven (miracles)

(miracles) on its side. And as these powers are now ceased, the Magistrates power in some measure supplies their place. For where does the Church flourish now in opposition to the State or Magistrature? And if not now, I will aver, at no time since the cessation of miracles. In Turkey, Mahometanism keeps it under; in China it is suppressed by Paganism; in Portugal it dares not shew its face for the Inquisition. In short, in all countries where it has not the countenance of the State, it is skulking in holes and corners, or obliged to be very cautious and circumspect to avoid persecution.

BUT the trick of annexing profanity to all established religions is a fanatick bait, contrived in the last century to hook in the giddy vulgar, and practised with no little success in our days. Let the doctrines of a Church be ever so conformable to the sacred code, yet if the Legislature should attempt to protect and promote them, they instantly degenerate into carnality. This, we are told, is *prescribing to opinion, this is interfering with Christ's spiritual dominion, and erecting a kingdom in this world in opposition to the kingdom of Christ.* These flowers of enthusiastick oratory, (like the Popish plea of annexing salvation solely to the Church of Rome, as being the only Catholick Church) serve as a substitute for reason and common sense, and to captivate infatuated votaries, who consider their teachers as the great arbitrators of spiritual affairs, *ordained to root out the Priests of Baal from the high places, and to cary on the cause of the Lamb against the kingdoms of this world and the powers of darknes.* Mr. Barber for want of arguments of his own flourishes away on this subject, giving us the trite cant of Oliverian Divines, which as Butler tells us

Made Tinkers bawl aloud to settle
 Church discipline, for patching Kettle;
 And Oyſter-women lock their fiſh up,
 To trudge away, and cry, No Biſhop;
 And ſome, for kitchen-ſtuff, to cry
 A Goſpel preaching Miniſtry;
 And ſome for old ſuits, Coats and Cloak,
 No Surplices, nor ſervice Book.—
 —A ſtrange harmonious inclination
 Of all degrees to Reformation.

BUT let us hear Mr. Barber in his borrowed oratory.

“THE Chriſtian ſyſtem cannot be formed according to the genius of a Civil Conſtitution. It is a ſyſtem ſimple and uniform. The laws of it are all contained in the New Teſtament. Every thing neceſſary to be believed in order to ſalvation, to make the man of God perfect, and to fit him for every good work, is there revealed under the immediate inſpiration of God.” Well, and what then? Why then the Biſhop’s general account of the Origin and Progreſs of the Inſurrections in Munſter, is abſolutely falſe.

“THE duties of Chriſtianity are far above human laws, their practice elevates the ſoul above forms, ſhews and ceremonies. All the objects of human laws ſink into contempt, when compared to that peace of mind which the ſincere performance of thoſe duties naturally inſpire.” Therefore all that the Biſhop has ſaid about the preſent ſtate of the Church of Ireland, is proved to be erroneous. But he goes on:

“CAN the Legiſlature of different countries mould and faſhion the ſoul to theſe virtues, and fill it with the love of God which paſſeth all underſtanding?”

standing?" If it cannot then the provision made for the Clergy by Tithes is iniquitous, notwithstanding all that the Bishop of Cloyne has said in their defence.

BUT what an absurd question is this? Who in the name of wonder ever asserted that the Legislature of any country could work miracles, which those must do who fashion the soul to virtue? I don't find that Mr. Barber or any of his brethren, though paid for it by their respective congregations, have got the knack of doing it, more than those Clergymen whom the State has thought proper to provide for: And if not, to what purpose is that ridiculous question proposed, unless to inflame the cankered zeal, and poison the passive minds of a set of people who have no opinion of their own, but implicitly submit all judgment in those matters, to their spiritual guides?

WHAT a contemptible figure does this same Rathfryland spiritual Pastor cut by this jumble of inconsistency, unworthy of the notice even of the Deputy-Synod of Derry?

But so have I seen on publick stage,
A Merry-Andrew strive t' engage;
Th' attention of a gaping croud,
By antick tricks and bauling loud;
And though his wit had been confin'd,
To bladder filled with peas and wind;
Yet this, when struck on head or shoulder,
Of an incogitant beholder;
Produces by its rattling noise,
The plaudits of old hags and boys. .

THIS thou hast got, thou acute casuist Samuel Barber! And may such be the reward, as no other can attend, such unmeaning rhapsody.

MEN

MEN are as necessarily led to unite together in a religious as they are in a civil society. Their common concerns in spiritual affairs render such a union desirable, and the interests of religion make it both expedient and proper. But if it be expedient and necessary that there should be an Established religion, why, says Dr. Campbell, should Episcopacy have the preference in England, when, from the example of Scotland, it is evident that the Constitution is as flourishing under the ascendancy of Presbyterianism? To this I shall give no other answer, but that England has thought proper to adopt that mode of serving God; and I don't know whether a better answer can be given, or is necessary, without entering on a comparative view of the tendency of each, to make good subjects for this and a future kingdom, which is no part of my present plan.

BUT it is necessary to observe, that those who may not choose to join in the Established mode of worship, have no room to complain of a violation of what is called the natural rights of men, that of serving God according to their consciences, or more properly according to their education; which is the only foundation of conscience in regard to the different modes of serving God: And which considered as a natural right, the Jew, the Mahometan and the Pagan may as justly claim as any Sect of Christians whatever. To plead conscience therefore in extenuation of a reluctance to contribute to the support of an Established religion in that manner which the law has directed, is leaving a gap open for Infidels and Sectaries of every denomination to intrude upon the Constitution; which no Government, that I know of, however indulgent to the religious bias of the subject, is disposed to admit of.

WHOEVER

WHOEVER therefore lives under, and claims the benefit of English laws, must take them all in all, without picking one and rejecting another. There is no distinction of Sects in the laws; the law which prohibits murder and injustice is as forcible upon one as upon another; and whether a man's education places him in the wrong with the many, or in the right with the few, in respect to his spirituals, he will always be right in respect to his temporals, by being amenable to the laws, which afford him protection.

THE Doctor says, that our present Ecclesiastical Establishment is founded on an act of Parliament of the 28th of Henry VIII. by which statute the Supreme Ecclesiastical power was vested in the Crown; and the authority that was formerly claimed and exercised by the Pope, was henceforward to be exercised by the Prince: And that the people looked up to their new Supreme Head to fashion their uncertain opinions according to his caprice or humour.

Now would not any body think the Doctor means to insinuate that the Parliament had banished Christ from his dominion over the Church, and had empowered the King to model her faith and practice, by his own caprice, independent of Scripture? That the King, acting agreeable to this power, formed the present Established Church? It is indeed the common slander of Dissenters that the Established religion was formed by the Parliament, and differs entirely from that instituted by Christ, and ninety-nine out of an hundred of the lower sort of that persuasion are as firmly convinced of it as they are of their existence; and if the Doctor intended to insinuate this, it was a base and unchristian intention. But let him intend
what

what he will, his assertion betrays ignorance and vulgarism. *Where was your religion before Luther?* is a question commonly asked by the most vulgar and ignorant Papist. Where was the Reformed Church of England before Henry the Eighth? seems to be the question of Dr. Campbell. And Mr. Barber gives us a sample of his malicious sneers at our Establishment, by saying, that we had an elder sister (that is the Church of Rome) which never erred in fundamentals, and from whom the Bishop of Cloyne enjoyed his descent by uninterrupted succession, and his right to confer orders as a successor to the Apostles. That according to the Bishop, all Establishments are right, and *the genius of the Civil Constitution only* (and not the Bible) *is to be consulted*. Is it any wonder then to find the illiterate Dissenter under an error in regard to the conformity of our Establishment to the Christian system, when their little understanding is warped either by the ignorance or by the prejudice of their teachers? It has been found by the faculty that a religious frenzy is incurable, whereas a Constitutional one has yielded to proper treatment and medicinal applications. Thus prejudice is found to be too obstinate for reason; whilst ignorance, more open to conviction, frequently yields to the powers of truth. For the benefit therefore of those who have been misinformed in respect to the origin of our Established Church, I must observe that its origin is in the Bible; there it is to be found; and from thence it has been copied. Our Established Church acknowledges no Head but Christ alone: Acknowledges no rule of faith but the Old and New Testament, where only are revealed the mind and will of God: She maintains that the prophecies of the Old Testament relative to the Messiah are all fulfilled in Jesus Christ: She teaches the necessity of an atoning Redeemer to remove the
 vengeance

vengeance due to our depraved nature: She teaches that Jesus is that Redeemer, and *that there is no other name under Heaven given unto man through whom they can receive salvation*: All her hopes and fears and faith are directed towards him as her Supreme Head; the King being recognized only so far as relates to her temporal concerns, of which she is the sworn protector, as she declares in her 37th article: All the duties which she prescribes relative to God, our neighbour, and ourselves, she has collected from that book, which she allows *to be given by inspiration; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness*: Her sanctions are such as Christ himself has given; eternal happiness to the obedient, and never-ceasing torments to the sinner.

THESE are the doctrines of the present Established Church; and if they are the doctrines of the Gospel, they are not the worse for having the sanction of Parliament, even though it had been the 28th of Henry VIII. which is not the truth; neither are those who preach those doctrines the more unsanctified for having the Prince and the laws on their side; the one rewarding them with an honourable competency, and the other protecting and supporting them against their enemies.

So that all the Doctor has advanced in respect to the pride, tyranny, and turbulence of the Hierarchy amount to no more than this: That before the Reformation there was *a wonderful and horrible thing committed in the land. The Prophets prophesied falsely, and the Priests bear rule by their means, and the people loved to have it so.* But that the Lord had raised up a King, who though wicked himself, was instrumental in promoting the true worship, stripped those
overbearing

overbearing Priests of that power which they made so bad a use of, and laid the foundation of a Reform in the Christian Church. That this Reform was not completely effected at once, because the principle of religious liberty was not immediately poured down from Heaven upon the first Reformers. That alternate persecution was the result of an intolerance prevailing on all sides. That this Reform, improving by degrees, is come now to such perfection, that though the Government has a favourite Church, to the Ministry of which it has annexed honours and a decent maintenance, yet it has restrained them from making a bad use of their superiority, at the same time that it indulges all other denominations of Christians in the free exercise of their religious principles.

THIS I say is the amount of all the Doctor has advanced relative to the abuse of power prevailing under the Popish Hierarchy, which the present Established Hierarchy is no more chargeable with, nor impowered, if so disposed, to imitate, than the Presbytery of Scotland; consequently is no valid reason why it should not, but a very forcible one why it should be the Established religion in England and all her appendant territories.

It is a common practice with anti-ministerial writers to take a retrospective view of the conduct of tyrant Kings and their oppressive minions, in order to raise jealousies in the people against the Government, from the old adage, that *what has been may be*. But this political artifice disgraces religion, where charity, that *thinketh no ill*, should be the governing principle, and conjecture should never be substituted for realities. In the commercial intercourse of the world, I believe it is a prevailing maxim to consider

K

every

every man as a rogue till he proves himself honest, and some think the same maxim should prevail in politicks; but in religion the reverse should invariably be established, and every man should be considered as honest till his conduct proves him the reverse.

IF therefore England chooses to have an Established Church as well in her appendant as in her internal dominions; that which she has adopted is as mild and pure in her principles, and more free from encroachments on the civil powers than those who pretend to be more reformed, because they have renounced the Hierarchy of Rome: For these in the discipline of their Presbytery have retained all the Papal tyranny prevailing before the Reformation, even to the depriving of Princes of their ecclesiastical supremacy; and by the terrors of excommunication filling the consciences of the people with needless and innumerable scruples, and restraining their actions in cases the most ordinary and innocent.

BUT it is no part of my present design to canvass the discipline or doctrines of Presbyterianism. As a Society they have a right to discipline themselves, and as Christians to promote their eternal interests by all those means which seem to them best calculated for that purpose. But then they have no right to censure the discipline of other Christian Societies, or to add such an ideal purity to their own, as to expect that all others must bow down before them, and that in every country where they make their appearance, the laws must be altered to protect and humour them.

I HAVE now taken a view of the Doctor's Vindication of the Principles and Character of the Presbyterians of Ireland; and plainly demonstrated, that

that though the Bishop of Cloyne neither actually nor intentionally impeached either the one or the other, yet that they are not so immaculate as to escape an historical censure sufficient to justify his Lordship's assertion, that they cannot be *cordial friends to the entire Constitution*. I should now quit the subject of the Established Church, was it not necessary to explain what the Doctor seems to think another inconsistency in the Bishop.

HE says that the Bishop, after branding the Dissenters with being enemies to the Ecclesiastical part of the Constitution, calls upon them for assistance in a time of supposed danger from the White-Boys. If this had really been the case, the Bishop would have betrayed a defect of understanding repugnant to the whole tenor of his pamphlet. But I have read his Lordship with all the attention I am capable of, and don't find a syllable that can be construed into the slightest wish for such assistance. After observing that Popery would in all probability take the ascendancy upon the overthrow of the present Establishment, he wishes them to consider, whether, in that case, they were likely to fare better than they do now? Because the countenance shewed by the Dissenters to the Roman Catholics gave too much encouragement to the outrages they were carrying on against the Established Church.—But as a paraphrase will explain the Bishop's meaning best, take it in his Lordship's own words:

“ You Dissenters who, though Presbyterians as to ecclesiastical discipline, yet, are Independents in a civil view; whose principles do not, like those of the Roman Catholics, tend to set up, but merely to pull down an ecclesiastical establishment; you ought to consider before it be too late, what will be the

effect of the ultimate superiority of Popery on your future situation. You have nothing before you, but an option of the ascendancy either of the Church of Ireland, or the Church of Rome. Of the former you have had a long trial, and under it have always experienced freedom of religion, and at present enjoy every civil privilege in common with the members of the Established Church. Your situation cannot be improved, however it may be changed for the worse, under the Church of Rome. It behoves you therefore to consider with attention and without delay, whether the present riotous proceedings in Munster, have not an immediate tendency to pull down the Established Church, and whether the conduct of so numerous and respectable a body, in the countenance you shew the Roman Catholics, and your manifest approbation of their conduct, may not decide the event to your own disadvantage."

SUCH is the supposed application of the Bishop to the Dissenters for assistance. Nor can the utmost stretch of critical subtilty fix any other meaning upon it. So that the edge of the Doctor's sneers is blunted by the dulness of his vanity, in supposing his party of such importance, as to lead the Established Clergy to look up to them for their intercession with Parliament, or to apply for the assistance of their Volunteers to protect them from the outrages of a Popish rabble. But indeed the opinion of their own importance is a rock that they have frequently split upon, as I have shewn, and could further shew, from the publick prints, was I not tired of being an index to such vanity.

SINCE, therefore, every Government has an indefeasible right to adopt such a religious establishment as they think best suited to the spirit of their laws,
and

and since that of Episcopacy has been preferred to all others by England, and her territorial adjuncts, we are in course led to consider the provision made by law for its support. That of *Tithes* which are said to have given rise to those savage barbarities, which the Established Clergy, and their Servants have experienced in the Southern parts of this kingdom; and which may be truly considered as the bone of contention between them and their Dissenting brethren. For had there been no publick provision made for the Established Clergy, their Dissenting brother-citizens would never have envied them of their ascendancy, nor arraigned the equity of Government, in bestowing an unprofitable pre-eminence upon them.

So much has been said upon this subject of Tithes, and the propriety of this mode in providing for the Established Clergy has been so ably supported, against the charge of its oppression, and discouragement to industry; that nothing new or more irrefragable can be advanced. I shall therefore content myself with producing the arguments on both sides of the question; and leave it to the reader to judge on which side the force of reasoning prevails most.

BUT there are two previous preliminaries to be settled. The first is the absolute necessity of some religious establishment in every State. The second is the absolute right that every State has to choose what religious establishment it pleases. Without the admission of the above, truth, though glaring as the meridian Sun, will not be able to penetrate through the dark shades of prepossession; or prevail against the chimerical hypothesis of a Christian Church unsupported by miracles, triumphing against the frowns of the Magistrate.

THAT

THAT Tithes were of Divine appointment under the Mosaick Œconomy will admit of no denial, and that they were not then an oppression or check on industry must be admitted, otherwise we must charge God who appointed them, with partiality to one class, and injustice to all the rest of the people under his theocracy. This is all the divinity that I mean to annex to this mode of supporting the servants and ministers of God; under which denomination I will venture to rank the Christian Clergy. The temporal powers of Christendom have considered them in that light, and so far back as a thousand years, have thought proper, after the example of the great Jehovah, to appropriate Tithes for their maintenance and support. If therefore the teachers of Dissenting congregations, who are excluded from them by law, will have it to be a tax, it must be allowed to be such a tax, as has the sanction of ages, the experience of the wisest Legislatures, and the example of the Governor of the universe, to demonstrate its propriety and good policy.

WHEN it was first introduced into England is not perfectly known. But if we are rightly informed it was under Offa one of the Saxon Kings. Since then the law has suffered no alteration from the different Legislatures except that of rectifying abuses, preventing of frauds and removing the obstacles which infidelity, libertinism and schism had contrived to cheat, and to perplex the Clergy in collecting them. Selden attributes the establishment of Tithes in Ireland to Henry the 3^d. But be that as it may, it is, as the Bishop of Cloyne says, the most ancient establishment in the realm, prior to the date of the titles of almost every estate, supported by common, and sanctioned by statute law.

No

No man can plead a stronger title to any species of property, than the Incumbent of a parish to his Tithe, for it requires no proof, but is due of common right. No other person has the shadow of a claim to it, nor has either landlord or tenant the shadow of a right to complain that his land is subject to that burthen; for on that account the landlord purchased the estate the cheaper, and the tenant pays the less rent; each has received a valuable consideration for submitting to it. Neither of them has in law or justice a better right to the Tithe of his land, than he has to any other property of any other man.

THEOPHILUS says that the title of a Clergyman to Tithes is antecedent to the title of any land-owner in this kingdom, and is founded on the same law of the land which secures to the land-owner the possession and enjoyment of his estate. This Mr. O'Leary calls a Paradox, because *the land was inhabited by the laity before St. Patrick preached the gospel*. What a wonderful discovery is here! Worthy of the acute Mr. O'Leary. St. Patrick it seems upon his coming to Ireland found lay inhabitants to convert, and was not obliged to preach the gospel to frogs and wolves. Well, but can any estated Irishman trace his pedigree and title up to St. Patrick? If he can not, then Theophilus's assertion is right for any thing that Mr. O'Leary has shewn to the contrary.

THE Bishop of Cloyne says, the national Clergy are not paid by their parishioners, but by the publick. The Tithe of the land is not in any sort the parishioners property, nor are they entitled to consider it as such. It is merely a burden to which their property is liable, like the crown or quit-rent, or hearth-money.

25

hearth-money. The stipend or fee to his own Clergyman is the whole which the Protestant Dissenter or Roman Catholick pays out of his own pocket. And that he should bear that expence, is highly reasonable: Nay it is unavoidable from the nature of toleration. If the State was to pay it the Sect would be established.

To encounter this, Mr. Barber says—I wish to fix your Lordship's attention to Tithes under the idea of *wages*. According to your computation one eighth of the people of Ireland only is of the Established Church, the other seven-eighths are of the two Dissenting communions. The business therefore of the Established Clergy is to instruct the eighth of the nation in the principles of morality and religion. Pray, My Lord, what value do the seven-eighths of the people receive for the wages they pay? If Tithes be wages, though the Clergyman may have the *summum jus*, it will also be the *summa injuria* where he does no service. Here is a fresh sample of Mr. Barber's coherency of reasoning. He wishes to fix the Bishop's attention to what his Lordship absolutely disclaims. That of Tithes being *wages* paid by parishioners to the Established Clergy. Wages and servitude have a collateral relationship. A man who hires a servant is obliged to pay him the wages he agrees for, so long as he retains him in his service, but then he has it at his option either not to retain him, or to remove him as it suits his conveniency. But surely this does not correspond with the station of a Clergyman, and the relationship he bears to his parishioners. They neither hire, nor can remove him, nor alter, nor withdraw his stipend, that being fixed and grounded on the ancient laws of the land; engrafted on all the lands in the kingdom which have been transmitted to successive

successive landlords, and set to successive tenants with that incumbrance upon them. Mr. Barber's question therefore in regard to the value received by the seven-eighths of the people is frivolous, because they pay no wages. They pay only what they are obliged to pay by the laws of that State, which secure to them their civil and religious rights.

THE Bishop of Cloyne says, the cottager (or tenant) when he took his land at a certain rent, was perfectly aware that the tenth part of the produce though raised by his labour was not to be his, but was the undisputed property of his parish Minister. If therefore the burden of both rent and Tithe be too heavy, it cannot with any shew of reason be set down to the account of Tithes, which is an original definite charge on the land, of which all parties were fully apprized; but must be imputed to the tenants having inconsiderately engaged for more rent than the nine parts could bear. If there be any extortion, the landlord, not the Clergyman must be the extortioner. The idea that a covenant between landlord and tenant should deprive a third person of his prior claim on the land, is too ridiculous to deserve a serious discussion.

To oppose this Mr. O'Leary says, whatever the Clergy possess by law is certainly their right. But I appeal to his Lordship whether at different times the cottager who plants the potatoe, and the farmer who commits the grain to the earth, ~~does~~ not realize the fable of the man who sowed the dragon's teeth which afterwards vegetated into armed men?

If the Clergy have a right to possess what the law gives them, what right have the White-Boys, or any sort of Boys, either in the South or the North,

North, to deprive them of it? And what apology can Mr. O'Leary make for saying that Captain Right's table of tithes, which deprives them of two Thirds of their value, is moderate and just? If dues are not to be paid because men find it inconvenient and are not willing to pay them, both *God and Cæsar* would be deprived of them. It is no wonder therefore to find infidelity, schism, and knavery combined to deprive the Clergy of their right. But as this mode of supporting the Established Clergy, whether derived to us from Popery or Judaism, is sanctioned by renewals of legislative acts for many ages, which stamps it with a probability of being the best; this mode ought to be complied with, till the wisdom of the present age finds a better.

Mr. Barber indeed throws in an objection, but it is so silly that it hardly deserves notice. If, says he, the tenth of the increase of our fields belong to the Established Clergy, ought not an allowance to be made for every thing that contributes to the crop? The seed that I sow, the oats which feed my horses, my ploughmen and my reapers, for these I paid Tithes the year before.

WHEN the Tithes were set apart for the Clergy, the Legislators had no idea that the land would produce corn, &c. without ploughing and sowing, therefore as they gave the Tithes they gave the labour and seed that produced them. As for their paying Tithes for their seed and horse-corn the preceding year, this is a quirk worthy of a petty-fogger, for those remained after the Tithes of the whole crop had been deducted.

THE Bishop of Cloyne says, it is frequently alledged, by such as give credit to the Clergyman himself

himself for a liberal intention, that this intention is defeated by Proctors, and Tithe-farmers employed under him. Let us therefore fairly inquire how far a Clergyman is to blame for employing or dealing with them. One indispensable reason for employing Proctors to view, is because the oaths of two persons are required in Ecclesiastical Courts, to prove the value of Tithes subtracted. The Tithe-farmer rents the Tithes from the Incumbent for a certain sum, and sets them probably at an higher rate than the occupier of the land would otherwise pay. But the Minister is a certain loser of a sum almost equal to what he receives by this mode, which is forced upon him, by the unreasonableness of the country people.

Mr. Barber opposes this by saying, the claims of the Clergy being often unbounded, and frequently unknown, put it into the power of the Clergyman to destroy any poor man who opposes his claims. Christenings, burials, marriages, milch-cows, trades, brood-mares, house and garden, and God knows what, have furnished claims. When a poor man is harrassed for such demands, he must either pay or sell all and go to America.* Thus numberless

* If Mr. Barber did but know the number of Irish Citizens who would be extremely well pleased if all those who have a predilection for the Americans were safely landed on that continent, and how far many would go, to forward those people on their journey thither, we should hear no more threats of emigration. Ninety-nine out of an hundred of their supposed new friends the Roman Catholics, would rather have their room than their company; and Mr. O'Leary himself I make no doubt would go so far as to give them his benediction, though I believe not quite so far as to fall on their necks and weep, at their departure. It is a general opinion that those who are dissatisfied with the British Constitution, would not be satisfied with any Constitution whatever; therefore such people will be no loss whenever, nor acquisition wherever they go, *Botany Bay* excepted, where they may form a Constitution suitable to their civil and religious principles.

suits

suits without end, and without use, but for the costs are instituted. In causes of this kind the heaviest purse generally prevails, and it is better for any individual to comply than contend, even if he should gain the cause.

HERE Theophilus steps in and says, It is absolutely impossible that any Clergyman, his Proctor or Lessee can exercise any exaction or oppression whatever. They are the only persons in the community, who, let them be ever so avaricious or griping, cannot by any art or ingenuity levy more than the real amount of their demands. If more is demanded for the tenth than the farmer thinks proper to give, he is under no obligation to purchase, he is only obliged to let him take his tenth, when severed from the other nine parts. It is no extortion to take what is due and no more. As for the assertion that suits are instituted by the Clergy for the sake of costs and that the heaviest purse prevails. I shall only observe that it is the glory of the Established Clergy to be united with the courts of justice in the slander of those who are enemies to both.

THE Bishop of Cloyne says, strictly speaking Tithes are not a tax, though with an invidious view represented as such. I allow that they are occasionally the cause of contention between the Minister and parishioners, and that they are a troublesome species of property to the Clergy. I shall further allow that if the farmer could put the value of the Tithes in his own pocket, it would be an encouragement to the plough. To this I would beg leave to add that it would be a further encouragement to the plough if the farmer could put the rent in his pocket also; but that is no reason that he should do the one more than the other.

BUT

BUT let us hear Mr. Barber on the subject. Tithes discourage agriculture, the true source of wealth to any nation. They are a direct tax upon the plough. The more a man labours the more he pays, and vice versa. Hence an encouragement is held out to turn the lands into pasture, and depopulate the kingdom. They are therefore a canker that eats away the very source of the population and national wealth. I know many farmers, who will not lime and manure their lands for a crop, on account of this grievous tax.*

IN opposition to the above, I must observe, That God who appointed Tithes for the support of the Jewish Priest-hood, did not consider it as a discouragement to agriculture. And if those inconveniencies attended them under the Christian Dispensation, it is very wonderful that so many wise States should submit to pay them for so many centuries. They must either have been an egregious set of political blunderers, or a set of bigotted zealots, to prefer the interest of a few ecclesiasticks, to the majority of the people. England, however, is to the full as wise, and free from bigotry as Ireland; yet she still retains the mode, without finding it any discouragement to the plough, for in no kingdom does agriculture flourish so much. As for what Mr. Barber avers, that he knows many farmers that will not manure their land on account of the Tithes; we know there are people who will say any thing to serve a turn; and this gentleman, in more instances than the above assertion, gives more than room to suspect him to be of that class. However, I may venture to say, that I can name ten farmers for one, who know their own interest better.

CAN it be conceived (says the Bishop of Cloyne,) that the commercial states of France and England, should in their various speculations, for the encouragement of agriculture, not have abolished Tithes, had it been so easy a matter as some persons conceive, to find a proper substitute for them? Can it be conceived, that the Clergy feeling, as they must, the trouble and vexation attending this species of property, and possessing as they occasionally did, so undue an ascendancy over their Princes, would not have brought forward some plan for a more easy maintenance, if such a maintenance could have been devised with safety to their order?

Dr. Campbell seems to think there is no difficulty at all in the business. You have advanced (says he to the Bishop,) several modes of commutation, and have overthrown them; and we will suppose your objections to be well founded, but it does not therefore follow, that there may not be other modes which would be effectual, both for the ease of the people and of the Clergy. Whenever Government shall be desirous of entering in good earnest into the subject of commutation, it will be no difficult matter to find out a mode that will effectually answer the end. You seem anxiously attentive to the emoluments of the Clergy, and seem to think it material, that in any proposed scheme of commutation, the amount of each living should at least remain as great as at present. But in a new regulation this might seem unnecessary or improper. The Dissenters earnestly wish, that Government may very soon engage in that arduous undertaking; but we know this must originate in England, and be perfected there, and then according to the changes that shall take place

place in it, there may, or may not, be fewer Dissenters.

It must be confessed, that the mode of providing for the Clergy by Tithes, is the source of broils and ill-will between them and their parishioners. This unites the luke-warm friends, and professed enemies of the establishment, in a wish for some alteration in the laws. The one from a kind wish, (mixed perhaps with some interestedness,) to free the Clergy from those divisions and offences, which too often result from their annual bargains. The other, from an envious design to bring them upon a level with dissenting Preachers, by grounding their subsistence upon a capricious benevolence. If the wishes of the latter were to be complied with, there would be no difficulty (as Dr. Campbell observes,) to find out a mode that would effectually answer the end. But though it is the Doctor's opinion, that in any new regulation it might seem unnecessary or improper, that the amount of livings should remain as great as at present; yet the Legislature are of a different opinion; they neither wish to destroy the establishment, nor intend to compliment the Dissenters, by rendering it contemptible; but in any change to fix it upon as permanent and respectable a footing as it now stands. Here lies the difficulty that has baffled the wisdom of ages. For though time cures some evils, yet it sometimes has the property of rendering others more obstinate, and this of Tithes perhaps is one of those hopeless habits, which it has hitherto been considered as dangerous to tamper with, and much more so to attempt a precipitate cure.

THE Doctor is very ingenuous in expressing his own and his brethrens wishes, that the Legislature would

would very soon undertake this alteration in the establishment; but, I think (as he does,) that the completion of these wishes must originate in England; from thence the establishment came, and from thence must come the plan of commutation. But if there is any wish for a comprehension of Dissenters, the Doctor very modestly intimates, that they must be consulted in the business, (as he says) according to the change that shall take place, there may, or may not, be fewer Dissenters. That is, the Dissenters are willing to adopt the Episcopalians as brother Christians, provided they renounce Episcopacy, Forms of Prayer, and every thing else, but the emoluments of the Church, of which they have no objection to be joint partakers. That this is the Doctor's meaning, is evident, from his saying, *that if in the course of things it should appear eligible to the wisdom of Parliament, to change the Establishment, there would be no want of another National Church, since the Presbyterians, who far outnumber the present Established Church, would give greater strength to the Constitution.*

THIS is speaking honestly and plainly, and I honour the Doctor for so unreserved a declaration of his mind. I am almost tempted to suspect him as the author of some of those blunt paragraphs, I quoted from the Belfast Mercury. But if it should so happen, as he wishes, that the Legislature of England and Ireland should think it for the interest and happiness of the kingdoms, (as he expresses himself) to abolish the present Ecclesiastical Establishment by Acts of Parliament; it is to be hoped, however the Dissenters may falsely boast of their majority as citizens, that they will find themselves a minority in the senate, whenever the establishment comes to be discussed: For as the
Bishop

Bishop of Cloyne, justly observes, *the notion that the whole of our Constitution should be trusted to them will not bear examination.*

IF the undue influence of an establishment under the spiritual supremacy of the Pope be a reason, for abolishing the present establishment, from the apprehensions of a return of the same influence: Surely the overthrow of the establishment under the predominancy of Presbyterianism, must be a reason, (a fortiori) to prevent the return of that power, which gave no quarter to Prelacy; and to defeat the unreasonable expectations of having the present ecclesiastical Hierarchy torn to pieces, to keep them in good humour with the government.

NEVERTHELESS, if any plan can be devised, less burthensome to the people, yet adequate to the present provision, and not diminishable by time, I will venture to say, it will be as acceptable to the Clergy in particular, as to the people at large. But for the reasons already assigned, it is to be feared there is more difficulty in the affair than some people apprehend, and I am confirmed in this opinion, from a recent miscarriage of a nobleman, a Lord Chancellor of England; and what is more to his honour, a very religious and good man; I mean the present Lord Bathurst, to whom all parties might safely trust their interest, as far as fallibility may be trusted. This nobleman had set his heart upon this business and employed his great legal abilities in obviating the numerous difficulties attending it; yet after he had digested it with all the accuracy in his power, it proved defective, and was lost in the discussion.

THAT Dissenters may not be too sanguine, and in the end disappointed in their hopes, it may not be improper to observe, that this nobleman, by his plan, had not the most distant design to curtail the present provision for the Clergy, or to leave it to the vicissitude of years to curtail it, both of which he guarded with as much care as possible: Nor would the Legislature attend to any plan, wherein these were neglected. Fanaticism did too much mischief in the late century, to have many senatorial advocates in this.

HOWEVER as it is reported that the affair will be brought forward by a member of the lower house, and probably may be debated next sessions of Parliament, instead of adding to the many exceptionable plans already produced, I shall mention some of the modes adopted by the Legislatures of different American colonies, to provide for the Established Clergy.

IN South Carolina, there is an hundred pounds sterling a year allotted to every parish, and paid by the Provincial Treasurer, out of duties arising from the importation of rum. This with a comfortable house, and a large tract of glebe land, together with parochial dues for weddings, christenings and funerals, make a very ample provision for the Clergy; because most of the necessaries of life may with very little industry be raised on the glebe.

IN North Carolina the legal stipend is an hundred pounds sterling also; but as there are no duties allotted, as in the southern province, for the payment of the salary, the vestry are obliged by law to raise it by applotment on the parishioners, in proportion

proportion to the number of negroes, stock of cattle, and quantity of land each person is possessed of; this the Sheriff collects with other public taxes, and pays it to the Clergyman; and this with glebe-land, and parochial dues, places the Clergy in very comfortable circumstances.

IN Virginia the Minister's stipend is paid him in tobacco, which is the staple of the country, and is never less than two, but often three pence a pound. Every parish is obliged to pay the Clergyman sixteen thousand pounds weight of tobacco, which is apportioned on the parishioners by the vestry, in proportion to their negroes, stock, &c. This with parochial dues, and glebe-house and land, make a very ample provision, and give the Clergyman some importance in his parish.

IN Maryland the livings vary in proportion to the number of parishioners, because every parishioner pays thirty pounds weight of tobacco to the Clergyman, every slave being reckoned a Parishioner. Some of the livings in this province amount to six or seven hundred pounds a year, and none of them below three hundred, with a good house and glebe.

IN the more Northern provinces, Dissention has the ascendancy, and the few Episcopal Clergy settled amongst them are supported by the society for the propagation of the gospel.

I SHALL now turn myself to the West-Indies, and shall begin with Jamaica, that being the most considerable under the British dominions.

IN this island there is no other mode of publick worship, but that of the Established Church of England. To every parish there is an annual stipend allotted by the Legislature of the island, but not to all parishes alike. Those in the towns of Port-Royal, Spanish-town, and Kingston, as also the parish of Ligance, within four miles of Kingston, have 300l. a year each; all the rest 250l. except the parish of Portland, and another parish the name of which I have forgot; these two last not being sufficiently peopled, the law has assigned but an hundred pounds a year to the Ministers. These respective salaries, the vestry of each parish are obliged to raise by applotment on the parishioners. The livings in general are very beneficial, owing to the parochial dues. The living of Ligance in particular, being as I said within four miles of Kingston, and having a very extensive glebe, which is parcelled out into small villas, or country retreats for merchants, and other wealthy inhabitants of the town, raises the income to 1500l. a year; this is an accidental circumstance, owing to its contiguity to a flourishing and wealthy town; but it is by no means the case of other parishes, whose glebes do little more than raise a few sheep, poultry, and provisions for the family and negroes.

THE vestry in this island, and in all the islands, as well as in America, consists of twelve men, chosen every year by the suffrage of freeholders; these, and no others, have a right to interfere in the business of the parish for that year.

THE church establishment in the rest of the islands, being upon the same plan of that in Jamaica, I need not swell the account to a greater bulk, as it will only be a repetition of the same Ecclesiastical oeconomy,

œconomy, in which I see nothing to govern our Legislators in a commutation for Tithes, except in the article of land. And as most of the estates in the kingdom are held, and set, liable to this impost, and as those estates which are exempt from it, are generally charged at three shillings an acre additional rent; if every landlord was to give 20 years purchase for the Tithes at that rate, and that money was to be laid out in the purchase of land, not in seperate portions but in one compact body; and the Incumbent permitted to lease this land out as Bishops do, but always at a reserved rent of three-fourths at least of the real value of land, of the same quality and neighbourhood: this would be a permanent provision for the Clergy, and a more adequate commutation than any of the plans I have yet seen.

BUT I am greatly mistaken if those who are most clamorous for a commutation under the pretence of removing the inconveniences of the Clergy, and the burthen of the poor, are actuated by the smallest regard for either. All the pamphlets that I have seen on the subject, betray a manifest design to ruin the one without benefiting the other. Mr. O'Leary ridicules this mode of providing for the Clergy, as being an appendage of Popery. He says, under the various changes of creeds, the lucrative system remained unaltered. A Pope, he says, sequestered the tenth bee-hive, but that the Established Clergy, by insisting on the Tithes of Agistment, raised their claims from a bee to a bullock. Mr. Barber reprobates the mode as anti-scriptural, and with a sneer, which is always a substitute for argument, and with the illiterate passes for such, says, He expected to find some grant or charter from Heaven, to the Episcopal Clergy
of

of Ireland, to demand Tithes from Dissenters and Roman Catholicks. But that they who form their religious opinions from the bible, find many positive precepts against Ecclesiastical Establishments of any kind. The two he mentions, which I suppose are the strongest he could find, I shall transcribe as a sample of what he is able to produce. Christ had declared *his kingdom was not of this world. The Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion, but it shall not be so among you, but whosoever would be greatest, let him be a minister, and whosoever would be chief let him be a servant.* What a wonderful sagacity must that man have as a commentator on the bible, who can see a precept against Ecclesiastical Establishments, in a check given to the ambition of the Disciples? It is something like that of the Romish Church, which sees a precept for the persecution of Hereticks, in an invitation to a marriage feast. I remember as arch a wiseacre as Mr. Barber, undertake to prove that no society of Christians served God in all respects agreeable to scripture; for those who do so should have a love feast amongst them once a week at least, at which time, the service should begin and end with saluting the women; that they should add a little dance to the solemnity, and that the whole should be performed naked. All which he supported by proofs, in my opinion, as strong as those produced by Mr. Barber against establishments. But that other people may judge of the proofs, here they are. First, *The primitive Christians had their Love-feasts.* Secondly, St. Paul ordered the Corinthians to *greet one another with a holy kiss.* Thirdly, David commanded that *the Lord should be praised in the dance,* and the King himself danced before the Ark. And, lastly, Adam and Eve in a state of innocence were naked. Now let any body compare those proofs with Mr. Barber's,

Barber's, (which by-the-bye are not Mr. Barber's, but have been stolen by him out of the Dissenter's Catechism,) and if they don't allow one to be as valid as another, if not more so; they must have a faculty of discerning spirits, which I am unacquainted with.

Now for Dr. Campbell. This gentleman says, that the provision for the Clergy is too abundant; that it will scarcely be alledged, that morality and religion will be defeated, if instead of a thousand pounds a year, the minister had one quarter of that income; because it will be generally found that wealth is unfriendly to labour.

ANOTHER writer, signed A Farmer, is for abolishing Tithes at once. Tithes, he says, are the undoubted right of the Clergy; that they are well fenced in with law and gospel is admitted on all hands, that they are co-eval with the Constitution I believe, but be that as it will, provided they are not co-eternal with the Constitution, I am perfectly easy as to their origin.

HERE may be observed, a Papist sneering at Tithes as a remnant of Popery, which the Clergy still retain; borrowing the pomp and splendor of the Popish Hierarchy, whilst they pronounce the Pope to be Antichrist.

HERE likewise appears an Independent, arraigning them as unchristian, because not expressly commanded by Christ; and even throwing out an indirect menace not to pay them. A century hence, says he, when it appears that Tithes were paid by the whole people of Ireland, to the teachers of the eighth part, they will immediately conclude that
th

the Presbyterians were a conquered people, or they never would have submitted to such a disgraceful situation as to be Helots of the Episcopalians; but must rather conclude, that the Presbyterians took every advantage of their oppressors. This likewise has been stolen from the Belfast Mercury, published when the Presbyterians had warmed themselves into an opinion that the Volunteers would overthrow the Church Establishment.

HERE also steps forward a Presbyterian, and professed approver of Establishments, and pleads for the alteration of this mode, and reducing the Established Clergy to such a state of penury as always attends those who depend on the benevolence of their hearers for a maintenance, telling us that if this mode was adopted, many complaints concerning the Clergy would be no longer heard of.

AND in the rear of these, A Farmer advances with his reprobation of Tithes, calling them *the Original Sin* with which every acre of land in these kingdoms is born and cursed, declaring that they should be taken off, and the Clergy compelled to accept a modus, and pronouncing it nonsense to say that the Clergy should have such a provision as is not liable to decrease, for why, says he, should every thing be sacrificed to their avarice?

HENCE it is plain that the tribe of Establishment opposants have nothing less in view than the relief of the distressed peasantry, and nothing so much as the reduction of the Clergy, to the rank of *Almsmen*, or *Orison-Mendicants* in their respective parishes: And for the effecting of this state of humiliation, they look up to the Parliament, as if the Parliament (to use Theophilus's words,) was not obliged

obliged to consider the Clergy as a part of the community, intitled to the same measure of justice with other subjects of the kingdom; but that their properties might, at any time, be taken from them without equivalent, to gratify those who dissent from the establishment; or (as he expresses himself in another place) as if this Protestant State shall enact laws to abridge (or to annihilate) the maintenance of the Clergy, and consequently root out the Established Religion.

THE Priest, at the tail of his sneers upon Tithes, says that no man in his senses will deny that the supreme powers of the State have a right to alter any system for the peace and good of the community. But if one part of the community should think that it would contribute to the peace and good of the whole, to make a law that all the Catholic Clergy should be converted into Eunuchs, and the Parliament should think proper to pass such a law, would the Priest give up his senses so far as to acknowledge this a proper exercise of their power?

THE Independent says, that the Legislature can easily, and with as little danger to the State, change the Ecclesiastical Establishment as it can the mode of collecting the revenue, or disbanding the army. And to evince the little impropriety of so doing, he offers a very witty, and to be sure a very convincing argument. I believe, says he, if the train of *Arch-Bishops, Lords-Bishops, Deans, &c. &c. and even Tithes were annihilated this day that the Sun would rise to-morrow.* What powerful reasoning is here? enough to convince the most vigorous Church-man in the Senate of the propriety of abolishing Episcopacy. I am sure there is not an old Lady in his flock, but must applaud this wonderful discovery.
For

For my part, I am so pleased with it, that I can't help enlarging upon it. Therefore, I say, if the Parliament should consider the Independents in our days, as Sir Francis Bacon represents the Fanaticks in his, *a sort of Hypocrites that are ever handling holy things without feeling, whose scruple is only a restif jadish humour of struggling with authority, the duties of whose Religion are discharged in the bare naming of it, whose worship is translated from the Law to the Schism, from the Church to the Conventicle, and whose Reformation is but a Godly Libel, outrageous principles, and implacable Antipathies.* If the Parliament, I say, should entertain this opinion of them, (and it is as favourable as their opinion of the Established Church,) and should, (as he expresses himself,) enact another Schism Bill, and shut up their Meeting-houses, as it was found necessary to do after the Restoration, and this should send them all to America; I think, not only, that the Sun would rise the next day after their departure, but that we should not be a whit the more popified in point of Religion, nor a whit the less flourishing in point of commerce, nor a whit the less fruitful in point of agriculture, nor a whit the less tranquil in point of loyalty than we now are; but would Mr. Barber think that the Parliament kept within bounds of its authority, by having recourse to such wholesome severities?

THE Presbyterian says that the Establishment should be considered as a matter of regulation, which may be modelled according to the views of Government, and may be continued or laid aside, and the civil Constitution be in no danger.

AND

AND the Farmer says, that the Government of every country is competent to alter and new-model every order of Subjects, and why should it not regulate the Priesthood?

IT is a matter of no great moment whether the Establishment may be modelled according to the views of Government, or not, provided it is not modelled according to the views of Dissenters; and the Priesthood may safely trust to the regulation of Government so long as such men as the Farmer are excluded from power. But that is no reason that where Christianity is seen through different mediums, the Legislature should not prefer that which to them appears the purest and most unfullied.

BUT what arbitrary Government may do is not the question. The question is whether a Government such as ours is, can take from any man, or body of men, a property secured to them by successive Legislatures, many ages back, without giving them an equivalent for it? This, I say, is a question not uncontrovertibly fixed. In all cases but that of depriving the Clergy of their long established maintenance, it is absolutely denied. Mr. Barber himself denies it. He says that the reign of Charles the First was a continued violation of the liberties of the nation. That the Church and Crown conspired to bereave the subject of all the rights of a free people. That is, (as he explains himself,) *by vexing and tyrannizing over the Puritans* (over those virtuous Independants, described by Sir Francis Bacon,) *of those days*. Let us hear how feelingly he speaks of those holy Reformers of Church and State, and how indignantly he resents the profane usage that was given them. I am unwilling to
recite

recite the dreadful sufferings of those Saints and Martyrs, whose blood was shed for the testimony of Jesus; and who are now under the altar, saying, *how long O Lord, Holy and True, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell upon the earth? Such a Church and such a Prince when they had filled up the measure of their iniquity, fell together, and offered an awful lesson to all Tyrants and oppressors of mankind.*

As Mr. Barber has thought proper to canonize this godly party of Puritan Apostles, I shall give you a picture of the established Hierarchy, drawn by one of those meek and holy promoters of the Kingdom of Christ, which will shew how richly they deserve the rays of glory with which their faithful Rathfryland brother has thought proper to incircle them.

“ ARCHBISHOPS, and Bishops, are unlawful, unnatural, false, and bastardly governors of the Church, and the ordinance of the Devil, petty Popes, petty Antichrists, like incarnate Devils, cogging, couzening knaves, they will lie like Dogs, proud, popish, presumptuous, profane, paultry, pestilent, pernicious Prelates, and Usurpers; impudent, shameless, wainscot-faced Butchers, Horse-leeches, Robbers, Wolves, Simoniacks, Persecutors, sowers of Sedition, their Anti-christian Courts are the Synagogues of Satan, the Beelzebub of Canterbury, the Canterbury Caiphas, Esau, a monstrous Anti-christian Pope, none ever defended this Hierarchy of Bishops, but Papists and such are infected with Popish errors. All the Newgates and Oldgates, yea, and all the Tyburns in England, are too little for such rash and presumptuous heads, that will not give God leave to rule, but will take the Sceptre out of his hands.

hands. The laws maintaining the Archbishops are no more to be accounted of than the laws maintaining the Stews." (See Bancroft's *Dangerous Positions*, Book II. Chap. 12.)

I SHALL finish the above picture, with an exulting acclamation, which one of those reforming Saints, (a Mr. Jenkins,) uttered before the Parliament, September 24, 1656, to be found in the same book, (*Dangerous Positions*) page 23.

" Praised be God, who hath delivered us from the imposition of prelatical innovations ; altar geneffluxions, and cringings with crossings, and all that Popish trash and trumpery ; and truly I speak no more than what I have often thought, and said, the removal of those unsupportable burthens countervailed for the treasure and blood shed and spent in the late distractions."

HERE you have the spirit of those Saints, who (according to Mr. Barber's, canonization) are now lying under the altar, and calling for vengeance on the Established Hierarchy ; their language shews the bitterness of the fountain, from whence it issued ; it is not only contrary to the Holy Spirit, but it is such as Paganism would blush at. Whether the Saints of the same complexion, in our days, are tympanized by the same bitter waters of jealousy, is more than I shall take upon me to say. The several paragraphs which I have already quoted from the Belfast Mercury will settle that point better than I can do ; to which I shall add one more, which is to be found in that of the 26th of July 1785. A writer under the signature of Eudoxus, (blaming another writer, for saying we have many good and wholesome laws,) says, *I am not a little*

little surprised, how you have sified out those good wholesome and salutary laws, made under the present Government. Are they Civil? Are they Religious? or are they both? Or were those strange amphibious creatures, those compositions of pride, absurdity, and anti-christianism, spiritual Lords, expelled from the Legislature when they were brought into existence?

I WILL admit the justice of Mr. O'Leary's observation, That no church ought to be faddled with the opinions of a private individual; But I shall expect, on the other hand, that no private individual has a right to cancel (by his bare negation) a doctrine publicly avowed by a general council or synod: For what is right in one must be equally so in the other.

If the body of Dissenters are not answerable for news-paper paragraphs, (as I will readily grant they are not,) yet if some of those paragraphs can be brought home to those who step forward as champions of the body, they may certainly be considered as the sentiments of those who coincide with them in spiritual doctrine and discipline, at least, till he is publicly disclaimed as their champion. Mr. Barber has constituted himself the champion of Independents, and the spirit of his pamphlet may not only be traced in single paragraphs of the Mercury, but whole pages are copied verbatim from that paper. Whoever chuses to satisfy himself, may look into the Mercury of the 17th of August 1784, where he will find pages 25, 26, 27, 28, and part of 29 of this champion's pamphlet, so servile copied, that there is no avoiding the disgraceful stigma of plagiarism, but by adopting that paper as his own. I shall therefore combat it with an answer that appeared in the
same

same periodical paper, of the 17th of September following, which that I may not be deemed a Plagiarist, I do here acknowledge to be mine.

“ IT is from an undue reverence for the laws of the kingdom, that men are led to form the most inconsistent and unintelligible notions of liberty. Some people make, as it were, a mystery of it, explainable only for themselves, and intended as far as is found necessary for their purpose, to be the standard of their actions, and to be a good reason for doing what no other reason can justify. They constitute themselves the sole judges of liberty, and whatever they declare to be such, must be so, ~~and~~ whoever says not, is branded as an advocate for slavery.

THIS didactic tyranny—this false logic, is the very same that prevailed under the reign of Charles the First, when liberty became such an insatiable gulph, that it swallowed up all the rights and prerogatives of the Crown, all the privileges and lands of the Church, all the power and jurisdiction of the Peers, and all the religion and laws of the kingdom. Whether there are any that have the same ideas of liberty, and would exercise it to the same purpose, if they had it in their power now, is a point I shall leave to be decided by such publications as abound in the Mercury.

THE outrages of the White-Boys are attributed to the oppression of the Tythe Farmers only, but the raising of rents first caused this commotion, and was the only cause of that migration which followed the dispersion of this mob in the year 1762 and 1763. It is well known that when such people set up for Reformers, every man has his own particular grievance,
more

more than the public benefit at heart, and the enraged villain with power in his hands, will wreak his vengeance on the man who executes the laws against him; if therefore in the number of exactions a few Tythe Farmers were recollected and punished, they were but few in comparison of others who suffered in those days by those lawless ruffians.

IN Ulster, it is said the Presbyterians are forty times the number of the Episcopalians; this I will venture to pronounce one of the boldest untruths that ever disgraced a cause. I believe indeed they may be more numerous, but I must have better authority than a man who makes no scruple of asserting boldly what he wishes, before I can believe they are even four times the number; I live in the county of Down, in a parish where the Episcopalians considerably outnumber the Presbyterians; and if I am well informed, it is the same in many of the neighbouring parishes. But let the disparity be what it will; it is only local, and though he admits it to be right that Episcopacy should be established in England, and Presbyterianism in Scotland and Holland, because they are the faith of the majority of the people, I cannot think him so infatuated as to infer from this local majority that there should be a particular Established Church in the province of Ulster, in favour of the Presbyterians. And if the majority of the Sect should determine the national establishment, Popery would become the Established Church in Ireland, under which it is a doubt with me, if Presbyterians would fare better than under the present establishment.

BUT how does this mode of fixing an establishment consist with his notions of liberty, the essence of which, he says, consists in being equally extended
to

to every description of men? The Presbyterians in England exceed those in Ireland by a great majority. May Presbyterians then pay Tithes in England and be free, and yet become slaves by doing the same thing in Ireland? Or does that which is right in England, become wrong by being done in Ireland? No, I may be answered, that is impossible to be sure, but in England Episcopacy is so powerful that there is not the least probability of overturning it, and in that case submission is not slavery but good policy. But for Presbyterians in Ireland, with arms in their hands, to submit to the disgraceful situation of being Helots (that is of paying Tithes) to the Episcopalians, this is pusillanimity and slavery.

PROBABLY (it is said,) it was to prevent oppression of this kind, that his Majesty gave his assent to the Bill for establishing Popery in Canada. But in this conjecture, this gentleman shews himself an Ignoramus, if not some thing worse: For in this establishment, his Majesty only complied with the stipulated terms of laying down their arms, and submitting to his government. And for this adherence to the faith of treaties, the good people of Boston upbraided the King in the severest terms, representing this act as a breach of his coronation oath, and a design through the assistance of these Popish subjects to enslave his Protestant Colonies. I have now before me their address to their friends in Great Britain, on that act, wherein they express themselves in the following words: *Papists arrogate to themselves the claim of Catholic, and pretend a first concern for the salvation of men, at the very time the spirit of Popery is inimical to all that concerns the freedom of the human mind, and its native dignity*

M

nity and glory. *The tender mercies of Popery have ever been known to be cruelty. An Auto de fe is a festival to minds made bloody by that superstition.* The Dissenters of Scotland have much the same opinion of this religion, nor have the Dissenters of England a more favourable one as appears from the late riots in both places on account of the privileges granted these people by the British Parliament. But the Dissenters of Ulster have lately imbibed a larger share of Catholic wisdom; and can lay aside all civil and religious prejudices, except against the Hierarchy of the Established Church."

SUCH was the answer to that letter in the *Mercury*, which has filled four and part of the fifth pages in Mr. Barber's pamphlet; to which I shall add, that though it may be proper to consign to oblivion the sanguinary disposition manifested by these people, and to treat them with the mild and indulgent principles of the Gospel; yet when the warmest partizans of that bigotted race of Cromwelians, stiling these holy men of Boston, their dear brethren step forward as advocates for those whom the Bostonians call *the bloody-minded enemies of the freedom of the human mind*. When these fellow-citizens (Catholick and Dissenters) considering themselves for many years as religious Antipodes, and beholding each other with religious antipathies, become (all of a sudden). united in the bands of spiritual harmony, it looks as if they had some cause to carry, which they thought they could not effect, without such a junction.

WHAT the views of this seeming cordiality are may be collected in a great measure from an address to the Roman Catholicks of Ireland, (signed
Cassius,)

Cassius,) in the Belfast Mercury of July 23, 1784, which is as follows.

“ THE world acknowledges the delicacy of your present situation. The fate of Ireland stands in some sort suspended by your irresolution, and should convulsion take place you cannot be involved in the event, be it prosperous or unsuccessful. Hazardous then as your determination may prove to yourselves, and momentous as undoubtedly it must be to your country; what now remains to be done? Warned by past misfortunes, and alarmed in common with every honest Irishman, at the impending storm, who can blame the caution and silence, which at this direful moment you are so anxious to observe? But this state of neutrality and suspense cannot long exist—you must come forward.—You must mingle in the throng, and add your strength to the other virtuous men of Ireland. Would you render that strength effectual? Would you protect yourselves, and give the last consequence to your exertions? Learn the use of arms. Invited as you are to the Volunteer standard, why do some of you hesitate? Surely pride, mistaken pride, has no share in restraining you. Will you through miserable punctillio hazard your own safety, and the welfare of your country? When there was not such absolute necessity for your being armed, you justly complained of the laws, which seemed to invite the midnight thief, or dark assassin to injure and insult you. In your minds this legal disability was a most cruel and intolerable grievance;—and shall you now when a civil commotion is almost inevitable—When self-preservation, and the liberality of the age have superseded these unnatural and disgraceful statutes;

shall you absolutely reject the boon you so eagerly desired?—Are you wise in so doing? I give you credit for your present caution, but by knowing the use of arms, you neither deviate from the rules of prudence nor become rebellious subjects.”

AND as a further encouragement to these people to join the standard of the Volunteers, it was observed in the *Belfast Mercury*, of the 13th of July, 1784.—“That there is at least a million a year, of the income of Ireland, in possession of absentees, which is about a sixth part of its annual income, and in case of a Revolution, it is supposed that the property of all absentees would be divided among the leaders of the triumphant party, which would occasion almost as great a transfer of property as happened in the days of Cromwell.

SHOULD a revolution happen in this nation there would be also considerable forfeitures of landed property besides that of absentees; as all the supporters of the present measures of Government would most certainly be exiled, and their estates, it is said, would be granted to such of the military as would abandon the cause of despotism, and embrace that of liberty. This would make a transfer exceeding any that happened here since the first settlement of the Milesians, when the whole kingdom was transferred; and would amount to more than half the change that then happened.

CAN any man after reading the above be at loss to account for all this coaxing between these heterogeneous sectarists? *The Roman Catholics* (as Theophilus observes) *remembering that their ancestors lost their*
estates

estates by repeated acts of rebellion ; which estates are mostly now in the hands of Protestants ; and to the recovery of which they look forward with as anxious a longing as the Jews do after the land of Judea. As a spur therefore to their co-operation, here is a re-revolution, and consequently a restitution of their estates presented before them, provided they lay aside their suspensive fears ; come forward, and add your strength to the other virtuous men (the Volunteers) of Ireland, under the inevitable event of a civil commotion. And what was this civil commotion to bring about ? A reform in parliament.—What then ?—Why then the overthrow of the Ecclesiastical part of the Constitution. For if a radical reform was brought about, Bishops were to be excluded as the corrupt part of the House of Lords ; and such servants of the devil as rectors were to be extirpated by the concurrence of the volunteers—for who dare say their request would not be granted, as they have been already prosperous in their undertakings ? Belfast Mer. Dec. 26, 1783.

I KNOW there are several very virtuous citizens, (according to the political acceptance of that word,) who though zealous advocates for a parliamentary reform, would sacrifice their lives in support of the Episcopal Establishment, and would reprobate any reform that would effect an ecclesiastical change in the state, and I am persuaded that by far the majority of our senators are of those principles ; and though they are perfectly convinced, that it is the wish and aim of dissention, in all that has been said against the mode of paying the established Clergy, not to alter, but to annihilate the mode, yet relying on their own integrity in the day of trial ; they treat the aims and wishes of others as chimerical, insignificant, and such as must perish
even

even in the conception, But it should be remembered, what were the evil consequences of a similar inattention, to the interests of the establishment, under the clamours of the fanaticks, for what they called the liberties of the subject, which ended in the total overthrow of the constitution: And it is to be hoped that government will be vigilant, and whilst it dispenses its toleration to all religions, and its justice to all people, will confound the insidious machinations, and secret devices of the *refractory* and *discontented*.

T H E E N D;

